1955

A rhetorical criticism of the campaign speeches of Adlai E. Stevenson : a thesis ...

Max C. Norton
University of the Pacific

A RHETORICAL CRITICISM OF THE CAMPAIGN SPEECHES OF ADLAI E. STEVENSON

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Speech Department

The College of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Speech

---

by

Max C. Norton

June 1955

A debt of gratitude is herewith acknowledged to Dr. Howard L. Runion for his guidance and inspiration, and to Dean Edward S. Betz for his assistance in its preparation. Without them this study could not have been possible.

Max C. Norton

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED . .	1
	The problem	1
	Statement of the problem	1
	Importance of the study	2
	Delimitations of the study.	3
	Definitions of terms used	4
	Arrangement of the remainder of the thesis.	5
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
	Primary sources	7
	Secondary sources	8
III.	STEVENSON THE SPEAKER	9
	Background	9
	His origin	9
	Boyhood	10
	Education for leadership	14
	Preparation for leadership	17
	Development as a deliberative speaker . .	21
	The 1948 Gubernatorial campaign	23
	Ethical appeal	26
	Basic assumptions	29
	His moral and religious philosophy . . .	29
	Individual and state responsibility . . .	31
	Moral justice	34

CHAPTER PAGE

Sources of ideas 37
Family background 37
Originality of thought 37
Experience and observation 39
Speech premises 44
Local, state, and national governments . . 45
Foreign affairs 51
Taxes, spending and inflation 56
Social welfare 58
Religion and education 60
Labor 64
Housing 67
Internal security 69
Farm policy 71

IV. 1952 POLITICAL TRENDS 73
Time for a change 73
The mess in Washington 74

V. 1952 CAMPAIGN SPEECHES 83
The audience 84
Arrangement 89

VI. MODES OF PERSUASION 97
Ethos 97
Pathetic proof 102
Logical proof 109

CHAPTER PAGE

Evidence 110

Definition and example 111

Argumentation 114

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 122

BIBLIOGRAPHY 126

APPENDIX 130
(Adlai E. Stevenson's speeches included in this study.)

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The 1952 Presidential campaign ushered into national prominance the Democratic nominee, Adlai Ewing Stevenson.

His sudden and dramatic emergence as an important factor in world politics was due in part to his unique oratory. Dynamic in style and content, his speeches commanded the rapt attention of the American people for three intense months during which he delivered over two hundred and fifty. Of interest and importance is the new insight into national problems that he gave to the American voter as a result of these orations.

The problem is to analyze, through his public addresses before and during the 1952 campaign, the power of his oratory with respect to the enforcement of ideas, and to more fully understand his personality and philosophy.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It is the purpose of this study (1) to trace the development of Adlai E.Stevenson as a deliberative speaker; (2) to test the consistency of his ideas through a study of the speech premises and basic assumptions before and during the 1952 Presidential cam-

paign; (3) to analyze the mode of persuasion used in his campaign speeches with respect to the political trends and specific problems of audience adaptation; (4) to evaluate his skill of argumentation with respect to opposing arguments; and (5) to evaluate the general effectiveness of the campaign speeches.

Importance of the study. If Adlai E. Stevenson's call to greatness is a valid one, it is important that a study be made to determine the basis for it. To be an effective one, his speeches previous to the 1952 campaign must be included in the study.

Through an examination of the sources of the ideas, his basic assumptions and the premises upon which his mode of persuasion was posited, it is possible to determine to a degree the integrity of his political philosophy. If the criterion of a great statesman and politician is his outline for future national conduct, it is possible to partially evaluate Stevenson's call to greatness.

Of academic importance is a critical evaluation of Stevenson's power as an orator and politician. If his effectiveness as a campaigner was his ability to stimulate the consciousness of the American voter through satire and humor, then his call to greatness was amiss. Contrariwise, if his importance and effectiveness as a deliberative speaker lay in his power to structure the American con-

sciousness so as to engender individual responsibility, to outline broad patterns of conduct, to educate and to elevate, then his persuasive powers were justifiably effective.

Delimitations of the study. The scope of this study is restricted due to the lack of adequate background material. While much has been written concerning the 1952 presidential campaign, little material is extant on the public career of Adlai E. Stevenson prior to his election as Governor of Illinois in 1948. Further limitations were placed on this study due to the lack of a comprehensive bibliography of his public addresses preceding the 1952 campaign. The task of locating material on his views and exact public statements was an arduous one.

Delimitations in the evaluation of Mr. Stevenson's effectiveness results from the lack of historical perspective. To the author's knowledge, no work of this nature has been done from which material can be drawn. Inasmuch as further studies will be forthcoming based on additional research, a more extensive evaluation of his oratory will be made. To be an adequate study, it must include an analysis of his campaign oratory in relation to social milieu of the historical period. This must include an analysis of the antecedents which have social, economic and cultural implications insofar as they interact with

the ideas of the speaker. This, in effect, shall be the evaluation of history, wherein causal events reflect on the integrity of the speaker's ideas in functional existence.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Basic assumption. The term, basic assumption, shall be construed to mean a basic proposition or postulation assumed by the speaker. The term implies that truth is assumed for the purpose of future reasoning.

Political trend. The direction and tendency of mass political opinion.

The audience. The term collective is used to denote all hearers through the mass communicative media. The term immediate is used to denote an assembly of hearers for a particular address.

Rhetorical criticism. The evaluation and appraisal of an oratorical effort with reference to its ultimate effect.[1]

Rhetorical invention. The term invention shall include the Aristotelian concept of three modes of persuasion, the ethical, the pathetic or emotional, and the logical.

---

[1] Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press, 1948), p. 16.

Rhetoric. The faculty of discovering all the possible means of persuasion in any subject.[2]

Speech situation. The social relationship in which the speaker attempts to secure a particular response from a group of listeners.[3] This definition is intended to involve a face-to-face engagement.

Speech premise. The term shall mean a proposition laid down as a base of argument. It shall also apply to the first two propositions of a syllogism, from which the inference or conclusion is drawn.

Argument. The process of reasoning wherein the artistic and non-artistic elements of the speech are developed into a logical pattern.

Disposition. The selection, orderly arrangement and proportion of the parts of an address. This thesis shall use the term arrangement as it shall imply its use as part of the inventive process.

III. ARRANGEMENT OF REMAINDER OF THESIS

The remainder of the thesis is organized in chronological sequence. There are five chapters related to the

---

[2] Lane Cooper, The Rhetoric of Aristotle (New York: Appleton Century-Crofts, Inc., 1932), p. 7.

[3] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 6.

problem previously stated: the enforcement of ideas and the development of an understanding of the personality and philosophy of Adlai E. Stevenson. In this order they are: Background Synopsis, The Development of Stevenson the Speaker, 1952 Political Trends, The 1952 Compaign Speeches and Appraisal.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Primary sources. The information for this study has been gathered from various sources.

Of primary importance was the current literature of the 1952 campaign which provided a timely account of the campaign debates. Also of great value were the Illinois newspapers which gave many first hand summaries of Stevenson's 1948 Gubernatorial campaign statements and accurate printings of a limited number of his speeches.

Especial credit is herewith extended to the Democratic National Committee who provided many needed publications and other background information on Mr. Stevenson.

Some studies appearing in recent professional publications proved helpful. Robert Murphy's first hand observation of Stevenson on his campaign train in the Quarterly Journal of Speech (December, 1952) provided an excellent analysis of Stevenson's style and delivery. John Mason Brown writing in the Saturday Review (October 18, 1952) imparted some insight into his ethical appeal.

This thesis would not have been possible had there not been published The Major Campaign Speeches of Adlai E. Stevenson (1952) with an introductory autobiography. The volume included 50 of the major addresses of the campaign.

Most of the speech quotations are from this volume.

Secondary sources. Of considerable importance was the literature pertinent to the fields of rhetoric and speech criticism. Lane Cooper's, The Rhetoric of Aristotle, was the basis for the study. In The Rhetoric of Aristotle is found the philosophic substructure of the writer's point of view. Brigance' History and Criticism of American Public Address provided the inspirational basis. Of importance was the criticism included in this study by Forest L. Whan, who, writing on Stephan A. Douglas, brought to this writer's attention the importance of basing the philosophy of oratorical criticism on the psychology of the audience, the occasion, and the speaker. "...and not merely...the amount of argument, evidence, or emotional materials found in the printed speech."[1]

The basic knowledge of speech criticism was assimilated from various sources. Prominent was the text, Speech Criticism, by Thonssen and Baird. Basic speech texts include Discussion and Debate by Henry Lee Eubank and J. Jeffrey Auer; Think Before You Write by William G. Leary and James Steel Smith; and Basic Principles of Speech by Lew Sarett and William Foster; and W. N. Brigance, Speech Composition.

---

[1] Norwood W.Brigance, editor, History and Criticism of American Public Address (2 vols. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1943), p. 779.

CHAPTER III

STEVENSON THE SPEAKER

I. BACKGROUND

Governor Adlai Stevenson belonged to one of the dynasties of American political life. On both sides of his family his ancestors have been traced back to the pre-Revolutionary times. In the mid-nineteenth century they settled in central Illinois and grew up with it. Stevenson personifies the traditional midwestern aristocracy. His family background embraces farming, newspaper publishing, law, and other minor endeavors. In all these fields the Stevenson family has been uncommonly successful.[1]

His origin. The Stevensons immigrated to America in 1748. His father's ancestors were Scotch Presbyterians. In 1814 they crossed the mountains into Kentucky where they migrated to Illinois in 1852. Adlai Ewing Stevenson, I, was born in Bloomington, Illinois, and was subsequently to become Vice-President of the United States under Grover Cleveland in 1892. He was nominated again with Bryan in 1900 but was defeated. In 1908 he ran for Governor of Illinois but was defeated.

---

[1] James Bartlow Martin, Adlai E. Stevenson (New York: Harper, 1952), pp. 36-38.

His mother's family were Pennsylvania Quakers who early came to Illinois. His maternal grandfather was Jess Fell, an abolitionist, liberal educator, and founder of the Unitarian Church in Bloomington. He was a leader in the organization of the "Republican Party in 1854" in central Illinois. He worked for the advancement of his friend and colleague, Abraham Lincoln. He lived in the same house where Lincoln was a member of the General Assembly and was one of the first men to conceive of the idea of Lincoln running for President. The Lincoln-Douglas debates were said to have been his idea. Jess Fell was a Bloomington promoter who founded the Normal College there. He also founded Bloomington's first newspaper. The paper failed, but in 1868 he purchased the Bloomington Pentagraph together with his son-in-law, William O. Davis. Davis acquired full ownership of the paper in 1871 and it soon became as it is today, an influential and valuable property in central Illinois. Davis' daughter is the present Governor Stevenson's mother. At present Stevenson owns 23 per cent of the paper which has been the principal source of his income.[2]

Boyhood. In 1903, when Stevenson was three years of age, his parents moved back to Bloomington. Here his father managed ten thousand acres of farmland in Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, acted as director of a coal company and was active

---

[2] Martin, loc. cit.

in public affairs. Adlai's boyhood centered around the best social circles. Stevenson, asked recently about his family and his boyhood said, "My father was a very delicate, frail man physically, subject to migraine headaches; a family affliction which, fortunately, I have escaped. He was a very witty, amusing and jolly man. My father was an early scientific farmer and farm manager."[3]

Stevenson's interest in farm problems stemmed from his childhood interest in his father's farm business which also carried him into the farming business in his later years. Until he became governor, he owned and managed a farm of considerable acreage in central Illinois.

His family was very prominent in Illinois. Wherever he traveled he was known through the two families.

Stevenson's interest in writing was developed through his early affiliation with the family newspaper, the Bloomington Pentograph, itself descended from the original Fell publications, and through his father, Lewis Green Stevenson, who went to China as a correspondent during the Sino Japanese war, the war in which Japan acquired Korea and a spiral of misery about which Adlai Stevenson II was to write and speak fifty years later. Stevenson's interest in becoming a writer was nurtured amidst the vicissitudes of world politics. When the young William Randolph Hearst

---

[3] Martin, loc. cit.

started the Los Angeles Examiner, he became its assistant business manager.

Stevenson's traits, including his partiality for travel, politics, agronomy and his gregarious demeanor have been conspicuously displayed by his forbears. Stevenson's delectation for literature, journalism, and politics formed a tripartite basis for the development of his ideas. The philosophical substructure of his reasoning finds its root in early educative experiences in these fields.

Stevenson has to thank his mother for creating and nurturing his interest in good literature. Combined with his childhood exposure to journalism, he comes by this flair for urbanity in speech and voice.

His mother's encouragement was an influential factor in his appreciation of good literature. Helen Davis Stevenson was the daughter of W. O. Davis, the owner of the Bloomington Pentograph. She helped greatly in developing the literary tastes of young Stevenson by reading him Scott, Dickens, Thackeray, and Greek mythology. Adlai Stevenson's speeches reflect an appreciation for classical philosophy and literature. As he stated:

> I recall she used to read to us in the evening from early childhood. Most of her reading was Greek mythology and romantic writers like Walter Scott. There was a good deal of reading by my Grandfather Davis when we were young. In the poets I remember Bobby

> Burns was a favorite of his. I think my interest in American history came from him.[4]

The source of much of Stevenson's humor stems from his grandfather Davis who was extremely adept with timely witticisms. He was a great raconteur. According to Stevenson this had something to do with his political success. He became inculcated with American history. In Stevenson's words:

> Well saturated as my grandfather was with American history and a political figure, too, and my father, too, I picked up a good deal of that through the bloodstream.[5]

Stevenson grew up with politics--it was all about him. He was born into a political family. He had a proclivity for politics that was almost a predelection, and a blade of political thought formed much of the undertones of his daily living. The Stevenson home was always full of people, most of them political, and many were "distinguished Democrats." His early recollections include visits from many notable politicians of the day including William Jennings Bryan. Many a political soiree was held in the Stevenson home and receptions for the successful and the non-successful political aspirants of the day.

Stevenson's father was also quite active in politics. He was appointed Secretary of State of Illinois by Governor

---

[4] Noel F. Busch, Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois (New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1952), p. 39.

[5] Martin, op. cit., pp. 40-49.

Dunne to fill a vacancy in 1914. When Stevenson was twelve years old he met Woodrow Wilson who had recently been elected Governor of New Jersey. Wilson was an idol of Stevenson's. Stevenson has said, "He was not only a Democrat but he was president of Princeton where I went to school."[6] His admiration for the great Democratic leader of the first World War developed in young Stevenson an early interest in Wilsonian democracy and internationalism.

Education for leadership. In 1912, young Stevenson made his first trip abroad where he attended school in Switzerland. His education had suffered because the family had traveled intermittently through his early youth. "... I don't think I even started to school 'til I was about nine."[7]

After spending two years at Bloomington High School he took three college entrance examinations but failed each of them. His parents then sent him to Choate preparatory school in Connecticut and he entered Princeton University in 1914.[8]

At Princeton, Stevenson's main interest was the daily

---

[6] Martin, loc. cit.

[7] Loc. cit.

[8] Loc. cit.

Princetonian. He was on its editorial board for three years. His grades were average. His college photographs reveal him as being tall, slender, serious of mien; the overall effect being almost aesthetic.[9] While at Princeton he was voted the third "biggest" politician of the senior class. He attended many social functions that the undergraduate of wealth and social distinction at the Ivy League attended. He was graduated from Princeton in 1922 with an average scholastic record. He has remained strongly loyal to Princeton and has returned for several class reunions.

Stevenson's primary ambition was journalism. He had an intense interest in the writing profession. It remains an important factor in the development of his speech disposition and style. Upon graduation from Princeton he wanted to go into the newspaper business but his father insisted that he study law. Subsequently he entered Harvard law school but left after two years. The story has become extant that he dropped law school because of poor grades, but a closer examination of the circumstances prove differently.[10]

---

[9] Martin, loc. cit.

[10] The reason for his withdrawal from Harvard law school became a minor campaign issue in the 1952 presidential campaign. The Democrats at one point were obliged to squelch the canard that he had failed his studies.

In 1924 Hibbard O. Davis, the editor of the Bloomington Pentagraph died. Stevenson went home to the funeral. The ownership of the paper was in dispute between his family and his cousin's family, Davis and Loring Merwin. A dispute arose over interpretation of the wills left by Stevenson's grandfather, William O. Davis and Uncle Hibbard Davis. The litigation as a result of a lawsuit resulted in equal shares going to both families. Stevenson, to this date, owns 23 per cent of the paper.[11] It was decided that Adlai would go on the newspaper to protect the family interest, so in the summer of 1924 he became an editor of the paper, together with Davis Merwin. He had always liked newspaper work and this gave him an opportunity to express himself through the written word. He edited the Bloomington Pentagraph 1½ yrs while stayed on as editor for one and a half years. His father felt, however, that he should return to law school, so Stevenson enrolled in Northwestern University.

Journalism had become so much a part of the fabric of his personality that even after graduation from law school in 1926 he decided on one last fling at journalism before settling himself on a career in law. As he had previously traveled through most of Europe, he now de-

---

[11] Sources differ on question of ownership of newspaper. Some references attribute controlling interest to Merwin family.

cided on the Soviet Union. Inasmuch as tourists were not accepted by the Intourist plan, in order to effect entry, he secured Hearst, INS and Pentagraph credentials as a foreign correspondent. At Batum, U.S.S.R. all Stevenson's books, including Bernard Pare's Russian History, were confiscated by the Soviet government and he was obliged to board a wagon for Moscow via Kiev and Rostov. He was deeply touched by the deprivation of the Russian people and the persecution of the pre-revolutionist aristocracy.

His mission was to interview the Finance Minister, Chicherin, on the subject of the New Economic Policy. However, his appointment with Chicherin was never forthcoming and after several weeks of daily calls at the foreign office he left without it. As a result of his visit to Moscow, he received a twenty-five year head start on his colleagues in the diplomatic world.

His first hand knowledge of Bolschevik Russia proved to be an important educative factor in his preparation for leadership.

II. PREPARATION FOR LEADERSHIP

The phenominal rise of Adlai E. Stevenson to the leadership of the Democratic party is coordinate with his growth as an orator.

His speaking career can be divided into three periods: The first covers the period from 1932-48 in which he prac-

ticed law and was active in government. The second covers his career as Governor of Illinois from 1948 to 1952. The third period covers the 1952 Presidential Campaign.

What were the policies and principles enunciated during each of these periods? Were they consistent with the policies of the 1952 Presidential Campaign? To evaluate the integrity of the ideas enunciated during the Presidential Campaign of 1952, their consistency must be examined--the premises that serve as substructures for his reasoning as a determinate of the line of argument. The focal point is the revelation of Adlai E. Stevenson not so much as an agent for the communication of ideas in terms of effect on the immediate audience, but as a long range agent for the enforcement of ideas--the final evaluation being the effect on the flow of historical events.[12]

Between the years 1932-1948 Stevenson's career was divided between law and public affairs. As his importance as a speaker developed, more of his time was devoted to public affairs than to the practice of law.

Stevenson had little formal training for the speakers' platform. No known sources indicate training in forensics, rhetoric, semantics or any related subjects. His proclivity stemmed from the influence of the political and social soil in which he was nurtured. In college he was

---

[12] Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, op. cit., p. 290.

not a member of a forensic group. He showed little interest in the law but he had a flair for recording the dramatic. His background in classical literature and timely interest in the current flow of history gave him the equipment with which to expand his ideas into the stream of oral communication. It must also be noted that Mr. Stevenson, though not a student of rhetoric, had the sensitivity of a well seasoned debator, a subtlety of intellect and mental vision that gave him power over his audience. When he talked extemporaneously to small gatherings he was deft, witty and nimble in reply to questions. When he addressed large audiences on great occasions his speeches were vigorous in construction, clear in syntax, and eloquent in delivery. Since he had no platform training and little experience with audiences, professional politicians who backed him for governorship of Illinois in 1948 wondered where their candidate had acquired his proficiency. In fact, like Demosthenes, he acquired eloquence only by long and diligent practice.[13]

Little can be noted of his speaking career as it relates to the law. Until he entered government work in 1933 he was associated with "Cutting, Moore and Sidley," a firm engaged in a corporate and general practice which

---

[13] Busch, op. cit., p. 64.

included all phases of law except divorces, criminal trials and patents. He appeared only rarely in the courtroom.

Most of Stevenson's speech training during this period was in an organization called the "Chicago Council on Foreign Relations" of which he was the president for one term before he entered government service. As an inveterate world traveler and student of Europe, he joined the council soon after his arrival in Chicago, but his election to the presidency posed a problem for he had little speech experience. He was not called upon to speak, however, but only to stand at the council banquets and introduce the speaker of the evening in a few well chosen phrases.

The fear that, instead of a few well chosen words, some ill chosen ones would be emitted tortured the inexperienced president. The night before the appearance he wrote out the speech, rehearsed it, memorized it, and wrote the first sentence of each paragraph on a card which he carried in his pocket. Mr. Stevenson's apparent self-possession and his practiced professional glances at the little card in the palm of his hand convinced his audience that he was well experienced. The speech was quite successful and was followed by the same system thereafter with fewer cards and more success.[14] He has continued to use this method of preparation except for the more documented deliberative addresses of his campaigns and the highly

---

[14] Ibid., p. 62.

formalized epidiatic speeches as governor. On these occasions the speeches were written in their entirety and read from the platform.

Stevenson became a skillful, graceful and entertaining toastmaster.(15) His services were soon in demand. His reputation for epediatical and deliberative speaking during the 1930's was well known and by 1940 he had begun to consider himself more a public speaker than a lawyer. Martin[15] states there is some evidence that Mr. Stevenson devoted more time to speech writing during the 1930's than to his nominal profession, the law.

Little is known of his speech activities aside from those associated with public affairs. He was an adept after-dinner speaker and it can be assumed that most of his speaking engagements were of this type. As his prestige increased, however, through participation in public affairs, his speeches acquired a deliberative mode.

Development as a deliberative speaker. Most of Mr. Stevenson's deliberative speeches previous to his nomination as Democratic candidate for the presidency of the United States were made while he was serving as governor of Illinois from 1948 to 1952. His establishment, however, as a speaker of great reputation became known during World War II. It was a period of the great debates between the

---

15 Martin, op. cit., p. 53.

"isolationists" and the "interventionists".

With the invasion of Poland by Hitler in 1939 defense mobilization became a cogent issue. It was an issue to which little attention had been given. The midwest was then, with the influence of the Chicago "Tribune," considered isolationist. The America First, another isolationist organization, was also influential. To combat this highly organized movement, an organization called the Committee to Defend America was founded.[16] On the day Paris fell to Hitler Mr. Stevenson became its Chicago chairman. He promptly took the stump on behalf of Internationalism. He spoke wherever and as often as he could. His reputation as a champion of Internationalism grew far beyond the confines of the midwest Chicago. He organized mass meetings to persuade public opinion: "To aid the allies was not in itself intervention, but only a means of keeping America out of war." Many important notables such as Carl Sandburg and Wendell Wilkie addressed the meetings.

Additional opportunities were afforded him as special assistant to Frank Knox, Secretary of War, under Franklin D. Roosevelt. He traveled with the Secretary, wrote speeches for him and delivered them on many occasions. Demands increased for speaking engagements as he participated in wartime diplomatic work. In February, 1945, he was appointed

---

[16] Organization was founded by Wm. Allen White known as the "Sage of Emporia." Editor and proprietor of the Emporia Gazette, one of the most notable small town papers in the United States.

special assistant to Secretary of State, Edward Stettinius, Jr., and served as advisor to the United States Delegation on International Organization at the San Francisco Conference from which came the United Nations Charter. His particular forte was personal negotiation. He was shrewd in argumentation and adroit in handling negotiations with the Soviet Union.

III. THE 1948 CAMPAIGN

Stevenson's emergence as a new and unique force in American politics was brought to national attention in his campaign for governor of Illinois in 1948.

It was during this period that his philosophy of government became known in its totality, and the sources and nature of his basic assumptions and lines of argument. It might be noted also that his skill in argumentation and his ability to select and use issues on which he could posit effective lines of argument are worthy of consideration.

The campaign for governor was a long one. Stevenson opened it with a Jackson Day speech to his party workers at Springfield, Illinois, on February 21, 1948. The impressions left by this tyro-politician were lasting and profound. Early newspaper reports were quite consistent in their praise of him as an able speaker as well as an exceptionally well qualified candidate. The following is a typical report:

> Most Democrats knew Adlai Stevenson only as a name (at the beginning of the campaign). A grandson of Grover Cleveland's Vice-President, he is a suave, able, well-liked socialite lawyer with a lemony sense of humor and a tongue in his head that has won him a reputation for soundly progressive ideas.[17]

The Chicago Tribune, however, cartooned Stevenson as a striped pants diplomat.[18]

This caricature of Stevenson, it is written, had some effect on the intellectual caliber of his campaign, the caliber of which was lower than that of the 1952 campaign. From the very start of the campaign he amazed his opponents by his vigorous hard-hitting tactics on the stump. He ripped bare handed into the Republican Administration and spelled out advocated reforms. With clever bits of ridicule he demolished the "striped pants" label his opponents pinned on him by challenging Governor Green to pose with him in a top hat so voters could decide which one looked better.[19]

Stevenson was adept in fitting the evidence and arguments to the audience situation. He worked hard at his speeches and traveled over the state ceaselessly delivering several a day. He toured the state by auto, spoke at luncheon clubs, school auditoriums, union halls, and on court

---

[17] Time Magazine, January 12, 1948, p. 82.

[18] Chicago Tribune, February 28, 1948.

[19] Cabell Phillips, "Stevenson: A Study in Political Science," New York Times Magazine, 174:341, April 12, 1952.

house steps.[20] Martin[21] states:

> His campaign speeches showed a wide range of quality --windy, low-level campaign oratory to the precinct captains, tightly reasoned attacks on the Green administration, sins to downtown public audiences, large folksy talks to farmers, speeches charged with genuine emotion to minority groups, cold technical talks on taxes to taxpayers' associations. His timing was always acutely correct. He generally sensed the appropriate moment to issue a statement so as to gain impact on public opinion.

He based his arguments on the current issues or trends. He posed his speech in the best possible light and correlated it with the opinions of the audiences. Typical of his ability to adopt his arguments to the opinions of his audiences are the following propositions used throughout the campaign:

State Government. Corruption in State government must be stopped. Promised a reorganization.

State Police. State police are public servants first and should not be subject to patronage system. Proposed to place state police under civil service. Promised to carry out reforms in each of these areas of state government.

Mine Inspection. Mine inspection should be taken out of politics. Laws should be tightened.

Civil Service. Civil Service should be expanded and strengthened. Political appointees should be brought under

---

[20] Martin, op. cit., p. 75.

[21] Ibid., p. 77.

the Civil Service System.

Administrative Methods. Reorganization of the State Commerce Commission. Must be placed on a bi-partisan basis.

Economy. A balanced budget is a necessity. Continued increase expenditures on roads and schools, raise legitimate state salaries, cut inefficiency by firing superfluous employees, pare down politically advantageous contributions from State funds to local pressure groups.

In the main, however, Mr. Stevenson's campaign was a negative one, consisting of a series of unsubstantiated attacks on the Green administration.[22]

Stevenson's victory in the 1948 gubernatorial election by a plurality of 572,000 votes was a dramatic reversal of previous predictions. In part it can be attributed to an unusual adroitness in adapting the appeal to the specific audiences throughout the state. So skillful was he in adapting his arguments to the growing political trends that the contention of his opponent that the charges brought against his administration were not weaknesses inherent in it were easily refuted.

Ethical appeal. Victory in the 1948 campaign may in part be attributed to a strong ethical appeal. Accounts such as the following convey an effective appeal to the correctness--the righteousness of his cause:

Above all, he had probity. He was righteous, he was

---

[22] Ibid., p. 79.

> correct. He knew little of politics, but much of common honesty. He had come to straighten out the mess. In the coal towns, in the farm towns, he talked to people quietly, humbly, persuasively, offering them his talents. They paid heed. He didn't dress as they did, he spoke with an "Eastern" accent. But he was upright. He seemed a reasonable man. They would vote for him.[23]

Stevenson made a strong ethical appeal in his speeches. He evinced moral character. In this strongly worded attack against the Green administration Stevenson said, "This is a campaign to revive the people's faith in the integrity of democratic government."[24]

In another speech ethics was manifested with candor and straightforwardness. The line of argument is from simple consequences. He reminded his audience of the inculpatory error in the establishment of machine rule:

> He would not establish a machine because he could not be a party boss and a governor at the same time "without subordinating the interests of the state to the fortunes of the party.[25]

Stevenson's style had appeal to all audiences--it was correct --his delivery was perspicuous. The people, sensing these attributes, rallied to hear him speak. A tribute to his style and delivery is attested by the following account:

---

[23] Ibid., p. 78.

[24] 1948 State Convention Speech, quoted in "Stevenson and Douglas in Illinois," The New Republic, November 1, 1948, pp. 6-7.

[25] Ibid., p. 8.

In spite of cultural accents and a restrained brand of oratory, he is a persuasive speaker, and inspires rapturous outbursts of applause. His platform manner is poised, confident and gracious. He has an acute sense of timing; he never drops a line...[26]

---

[26] Cabell Phillips, loc. cit.

IV. BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

In analyzing the effectiveness of Adlai Stevenson's campaign speeches, the following questions arise: What were his basic assumptions? How were they used in the construction of argumentive proofs? Thirdly, how consistently were they used when tested against the problems of audience adaptation?

Moral and religious philosophy. Most of Stevenson's ideas are posited on some moral or religious philosophy. Every speech was an occasion for expounding principles of benefit to his hearers.[1] One of Stevenson's political observers summarized Stevenson's basic ideas in the following words:

> Through all his speeches run certain themes. They are ideas that are basic in his political thought and his character....There is nothing very novel about these ideas of his. Their novelty lies in the fact that he really believes them and can convince others....[2]

The most rhetorically significant source of Stevenson's ideas is a moral and religious philosophy, the good-versus-evil dichotomy. It was manifested in many ways--Efficiency of Government Operation vs. Payroll Padding, Deficit Spending vs. A Balanced Budget, Open Crime vs. Proper Law Enforcement, The Police State vs. Democratic Society. In a

---

[1] Martin, op. cit., p. 108.

[2] Loc. cit.

speech on the topic of Loyalty Inquisitions as part of the Police State, the good-evil dichotomy is clearly shown:

> We must fight traitors with law....We must fight falsehood and evil ideas with truth and better ideas...and in the long run evil ideas can be counteracted and conquered, not by laws, but only by better ideas...[3]

The good-versus-evil dichotomy is the basic postulation of many of his deliberative addresses. A formal address to the American Bar Association exemplifies this philosophy:

> Organized crime cannot thrive without the active support of many elements in the community, nor without the passive support of many more elements. The respectable business man who falls for the myth that a wide-open town is good for business is just as effective an accomplice of the criminal as is the politician who seeks to win friends by influencing people....The ultimate answer to the menace of organized crime and the problem of lax law enforcement is public opinion...too often public opinion is a sleeping giant....We have had too many moral crusades followed by business as usual...[4]

The good-evil dichotomy is manifested here as democracy vs. communism: "The American dream belongs to every American....The answer to communism is democracy; not less democracy or just enough, but more..."[5]

---

[3] From the veto message of "The Broyles Bill," Senate Bill #102, an act to protect against subversive activities by establishing procedures to insure the loyalty of candidates and public officers and employees. The bill was introduced in the 1951 legislature and was passed in the senate by a vote of 35 to 15 and in the house by a vote of 87 to 15, Busch, op. cit. pp. 136-144.

[4] "Address delivered before the American Bar Association in Washington, D.C., September 19, 1950," quoted in Exerpts from Public Statements of Adlai E. Stevenson. (Unpublished and hereafter referred to as "Public Statements").

5 Address at Los Angeles, Sept. 11, 1952," Public Statements, 'Communism'."

On bigotry as a weakening force in a democracy:

> ...Bigotry and violence contradict the sincerity of principles which have been our greatest contribution to human history. And today they are a visible encumbrance which weakens America's moral leadership in world affairs.[6]

On the topic of state vs. federal government interference in civil rights legislation he again interprets the problem through the good-evil dichotomy.

> ...We must recognize frankly their (the state's) difficulties. We must recognize too, that further government interference with free men, free markets, free ideas, is distasteful to many people of good will who dislike racial discrimination as much as we do.[7]

On the subject of political morality in government the profundity of feeling is strong. "There have been thieves and scoundrels, men who have betrayed their trust. I say that such men must be identified and punished without mercy..."[8]

Individual and state responsibility. Another important basic assumption is the responsibility of the individual

---

[6] Remarks before the Illinois Commission on Human Relations, Springfield, Illinois, October 11, 1951, quoted in Public Statements.

[7] "Address before New York State Democratic Convention, August 29, 1952, Public Statements, p. 5.

[8] "Address entitled 'Corruption in Government,'" The Major Speeches of Adlai E.Stevenson, 1952, September 12, 1952, p. 108. (Hereafter referred to as "Major Campaign Speeches).

in a democratic society. In a brief autobiographical sketch Stevenson summarized with dramatic poignancy his views on political responsibility:

> Somewhere in Italy (during World War II) I think I read about a public opinion poll which reported that seven out of ten American parents disapproved of their sons going into politics or public service, or something like that....I've often thought of that little morsel of news; fight, suffer, die, squander our substance, yes: but work in peacetime for the things we die for in war, no! There seems to be something curiously inconsistent about the glorious, eager, uncomplaining sacrifices of war for the security of our homeland and its cherished institutions, and the active distaste of so many respectable people for peacetime participation in the politics and service of that homeland and its institutions. Die for them, yes; work for them, no. Small wonder, I thought, that our "politics" is no better, and great wonder that it is as good as it is. It seems sad that "politics" and "politician" are so often epithets and words of disrespect and contempt, and not without justification, in the land of Jefferson and in a government by the governed.[9]

Speaking in Los Angeles on September 12, 1952 he again spoke out against individual lethargy, and adverted the need for broader participation in political activity:

> ...Whose fault is it then that we get what we deserve in government and that the honor and nobility of politics at most levels are empty phrases? Well, having asked you the question, I shall hastily answer it myself by saying that it is not the lower order of the genus pol, but the fault of you the people...your public servants serve you right. Indeed, often they serve you better than your apathy and your indifference deserves, but I suggest that there is always time to repent and to amend your ways....It Seems to me that government is like a

---

[9] Ibid., XVIII.

> pump, and what it pumps up is just what we are, a fair sample of the intellect and morals of the people, no better, no worse.[10]

Stevenson's belief that people "ought" to pay more attention to government was to him a moral question.[11] He liked to remind an audience:

> Patriotism, I have said, means putting country before self. This is no abstract phrase and, unhappily, we find some things in American life today of which we cannot be proud. Consider the groups who seek to identify their special interests with the general welfare....After all, we are Americans first and veterans second, and the best maxim for any administration is still Jefferson's: "Equal right for all, special privileges for none."[12]

Concomitant with the basic idea of the responsibility of the individual to society is the belief in the responsibilities of government. Commenting on these functions and responsibilities Stevenson said:

> Our government is the largest enterprise on earth. Its greater centralization has been inevitable because of growing complexity of domestic problems, and because of our enlarged responsibilities in world affairs. The problem now is to keep government from getting so big, so unwieldy, and so powerful that it will get out of the hands of the people. Government in our country must always be the servant of the people, never the master of the people.[13]

---

[10] "Address on 'Campaign Issues'", Los Angeles, Sept. 12, 1952, Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., p. 120.

[11] Martin, loc. cit.

[12] "Address delivered to the American Legion Convention," Madison Square Garden, New York City, August 27, 1952, Major Campaign Speeches, p. 19.

[13] Busch, op. cit., p. 224.

Correlated with his belief in the responsibility of the individual in a democratic society was his belief in the inviolability of the individual. Speaking on the topic, "Nothing to Fear in Difference," Stevenson points out the dangers of uniformity as a violation of individual integrity:

> We must forever banish the notion that there can be universal brotherhood just as soon as everyone gives up his faith and accepts ours...[14]

There is richness and desirability in human diversity. It is a part of the universal order within which we function.

> The richness of human diversity cannot be abolished. It can be resented and fought, but only at appalling cost. Difference is in the nature of life. It is part of our moral universe. There is nothing wrong with the fact of difference. What is wrong is our futile efforts to abolish it...[15]

Moral justice. Much of Stevenson's mode of persuasion is based on the fundamental belief in man as a "moral creature." On this assumption is posited a personal system of moral justice--a philosophical basis of judgment. That he was more concerned about the rightness or wrongness of a matter than with its legality[16] is attested in a veto message to the Illinois Legislature of the "Old Age Pension," bill:

---

[14] "Address at dedication of Temple Bith Israel," Chicago, December 2, 1951, Public Statements, op. cit., p. 7.

[15] Loc. cit.

[16] Martin, op. cit., p. 156.

> The effect of this bill is to require the state to spend many millions of dollars in excess of estimated available funds. Its sponsors, who profess the virtues of fiscal responsibility, made no pretense of providing the necessary funds by increased taxation...I can only assume, therefore, that the authors of this transparently political gesture were more concerned with raising the hopes of our aged dependents than their incomes. Perhaps such cynicism is good politics but it seems to me cruel as well as fiscally irresponsible --and, may I add, futile to the extent that its objective was political intimidation of the Governor. Had the purpose been philanthropic rather than demogogic, the authors would also have at least covered the recipients of other forms of assistance. But the others, the dependent children and recipients of general relief, are not organized politically as some have pointed out.[17]

A corrollary to Stevenson's belief in man as a moral creature are his basic concepts of our nation's moral dimensions:

> We live in a time of greatness, and greatness cannot be measured alone by the conventional yardsticks of resources, know-how and production. There are moral dimensions too. It is the urgent duty of a political leader to lead, to touch if he can the potentials of reason, decency and humanism in man, and not only the strivings that are easy to mobilize.[18]

The triumph of spirit over matter, the love of liberty, over force and violence is indeed America's moral challenge:

---

[17] The "Old Age Pension" Senate Bill 556 would have given a blanket increase of 10 per cent in monthly allotments. It would have cost the State of Illinois $14,300,000. No means were provided for the revenue it intended to disburse. The Pensions Union of the State of Illinois, upon hearing of the Governor's veto, promptly announced that the first item on the subsequent order of business would be to defeat the Governor in his campaign for re-election. Bush, op. cit., p. 148.

[18] Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., p. 30.

> The challenge of our faith and time "is the incessant worship of matter" organized in the vast international conspiracy. But the goal of life is more than material advance; it is now, and through all eternity, the triumph of spirit over matter, of love and liberty over force and violence...[19]

Stevenson's mission was a revitalization of honest political leadership. "...honest political leadership that despises the easy road to popularity and insists on focusing attention on reality and truth, however distasteful..."[20]

America's moral dimension is a reaffirmation of America's moral greatness. "Anyone who has seen the might and majesty of America and Americans as I have must be an optimist--the America that 'asks nothing for herself except that which she has the right to ask of humanity itself.'".

Some of Stevenson's most important basic ideas relate to his belief in the strength of America. For a logical exposition of principle he made the following statement:

> The strength of America is rooted in a great principle--individuals are an end, not a means...schools, colleges, labor unions, political parties and the government of the United States for American men and women; never the other way round. The corollary of the idea is that every individual must take responsibility for the whole....The basic requirement

---

[19] Major Campaign Speeches, loc. cit.

[20] Loc. cit.

for the success of a democratic system of this sort is, of course, that individuals see their country's problems whole. In a word, they must have perspective.[21]

V. SOURCE OF IDEAS

Family background. The first, and principal, source has its origin in the framework of family background. His family were traditionally conservative democrats. Early educative experiences in the Latin Classics, the socially correct "Choate Preparatory School," Princeton University, a grandson and namesake of a vice-president of the United States, and a socially prominent father who for a time was Secretary of State of Illinois (1914-17) combined to give him deep emotional security and integration of personality.

Originality of thought. While character and intellectual judgment had created in the broadest sense neither an improvisor nor an innovator,[22] the quality of using his own resources for problem solving had given him an originality of thought. Originality of thought characterized the rationale of every argument with a resultant individuality of content and style. On January 21, 1951, Governor Stevenson made a pronouncement of views on foreign policy. His speech, entitled "No White Man's Sword for Asia," ex-

---

[21] Adlai E. Stevenson, "Korea in Perspective," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 30, April 1952, pp. 349-60.

[22] Martin, op. cit., p. 157.

emplifies quality of originality in meaning and individuality of style:

> Military force alone cannot win the day for us in Asia. Our moral authority there is low because we are white and Asia is colored...It will take great patience, great insight, great restraint, for us who see the whole word in our own image and likeness to win confidence and faith in the great uncommitted areas of Asia. It can't be done with the white man's sword. But it can be done; they can be convinced that communist imperialism is not liberation but a more deadly enemy of normal aspirations for freedom and social justice than colonialism...[23]

On originality of thought as a determinate factor in both the quality of thought and individuality of style, the following biographical sketch illuminates with clarity the epistomological source of ideas:

> ...Stevenson is a man with a challenging mind... one reason he insists on writing his own speeches--it's a personal challenge he insists on meeting. Somehow he seems constitutionally unable to stand on the rostrum and deliver effectively the words someone prepares for him. On occasions when he is terribly pressed for time he has tried this. It doesn't come off because it is not part of Stevenson's make-up. With him a speech isn't words, it must mean something. And Stevenson doesn't want anyone, even his best friends, putting words in his mouth. "When it comes

---

[23] "Address delivered by Stevenson As Governor of Illinois, at Northwestern University's Founders Day, January 21, 1951." The Founders Day speech was one of Stevenson's first and greatest pronouncements of views on foreign policy. Although his voice became part of the "stentorian cry" of the interventionists in the "Great Debate" on foreign policy, in the context of the immediate news it became a minor footnote in the firmament of controversy. Adlai E. Stevenson, "There are no Gibraltors," in Vital Speeches, Vol. XVII, No. 9, February 15, 1951. pp. 284-288.

> to expressing an idea," he once said, "I have only two bosses--my conscience and my wrist watch."[24]

The second factor is the influence of the democratic party on his beliefs and attitudes. By tradition, Stevenson belonged to the democratic party. He was nurtured in an atmosphere of politics. His early beliefs and attitudes were molded in the political tradition of his forbears:

> ...Small wonder then, that as I grew up in Bloomington, I found myself in mother's beloved Unitarian Church and father's beloved democratic party. I guess I was a compromise to begin with, which may have predestined a political career for which I had no conscious stomach, and, I might add, no positive encouragement from my father at any time...[25]

Although democratic tradition was an important source of Stevenson's attitudes and beliefs, it was not the principal one. He emerged a candidate for the presidency of the United States with an unyielding faith in the American[26] two party system and, although he believed in the system and was firmly bound by family associations to the democratic party, his thinking was not essentially partisan.[27]

Experience and observation. Stevenson's principal source of ideas was derived from a multiplicity of ex-

---

24 Debs Myers and Ralph Martin, A Brief Biography of Adlai Stevenson in the Speeches of Adlai Stevenson (New York: Random House, 1952).

25 Public Statements, op. cit., p. 16.

26 Ernest K. Lindley, "Impressions of Stevenson," Newsweek, 60:17, August 4, 1952.

27 Martin, loc. cit.

periences and observations. Originality of thought, a derivative of variant experiences, was the creator of an eclectic personality, a quality which evoked examination of every facet of a problem. It was by itself the quality that made people call him indecisive and neither a "liberal" or a "conservative."

Stevenson's experiences can be divided into three important categories. The first includes his experiences as a Washington lawyer during the depression era; the second includes his experiences in foreign service; the third, the experiences as Governor of Illinois.

Stevenson's governmental career began as a young attorney when in 1933 he went to Washington to render legal aid to a rapidly expanding Agricultural Adjustment Administration. During the "depression era" his home state of Illinois was one of the hardest hit. Salvage jobs on farm mortgages and urban bond issues gave him a broad familiarity with the effects of the depression. In 1933 Stevenson, like millions of other Americans, was deeply stirred by "Franklin D. Roosevelt's First Inaugural Address." He felt the need to familiarize himself with the cause and effect of economic fluctuation. As a young, vigorous "New Deal Brain Trustee" he was exposed to the "Rooseveltan approach" to federal problems. As the "Roosevelt Revolution" had its

effect on the economy of the nation, Stevenson sought understanding of the depression and its causes.[28]

Experience and observation in the firmament of world affairs was an important source of ideas for this young man during the 1920's. He had traveled abroad a great deal. He had observed the effects of the shattered dream--the "Wilsonian Dream"--of world government. He was an admirer of this man who had labored more strenuously than any other man of his period to involve America in world affairs.

He had become acquainted with Woodrow Wilson early in his career and had shared his disillusionment over the failure of the American Congress to ratify the League Covenant. Stevenson since has referred to Woodrow Wilson in many of his speeches and writings--always with respect and solemnity. In an autobiographical summary of his World War II experiences Stevenson alluded to Woodrow Wilson so as to depict the influence the latter had asserted in developing his belief in the necessity for international cooperation as a vehicle for world peace:

> ...A year later, in the autumn of 1944, I was in England and along the western front in France and Belgium on an air force job. Like so much of "my war" there was little time to think, to meditate at all... yet standing one day--wet and cold--in Eschweiler, a battered little town on the German Frontier, I thought of Italy, just a year before, wet, cold and bloody too, of the South Pacific the year before that, hot, steamy and bloody, of North Africa, West Africa, the Caribbean and all the places I had been...I thought

---

28 Martin, ibid., p. 50.

> of the ghastly burn I had seen long before on those "Pearl Harbor" boys in the rows of white beds in California. I thought, too, of how the desperately wounded little Japanese prisoners had struggled to sit up and bow in a stinking, suffocating hospital hut in a cocoanut grove on the other side of the war drenched globe.
>
> Was this the everlasting destiny of man, indicted for his stupidity and sin, convicted, sentenced forever to kill or be killed? No, it would end soon...I thought of the Russian Juggernaut pounding, grinding toward us; the noose was tightening--yes, it would soon be over; and then we must start on something better; pick up where Wilson left off, with a broken heart and a broken body, and push on to end this ugly business before it ends us all; what was it Wilson said in his sorrow with the prescience of revelation? "For I can tell you, my fellow citizens, I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war if the nations of the world do not concert the method by which to prevent it."[29]

As previously noted, Stevenson had been a close student of world events. He had a broad background in European and Asiatic history. Knowledge of world history and an ability to place current events in historical context gave him perspective and dimension while experience and observation gave them meaning. He was well situated to view and scrutinize great events--historical movements such as the 1929 economic collapse; the "Roosevelt Revolution" and the second world war. He had become a supernumerary in the great human drama. The world was his theatre, he the audience and critic.

The fourth source of experiences stemmed from post

---

[29] The Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., pp. 17-19.

war activities as chairman and delegate to the United Nations Preparatory Commission. His methodology in handling problems of setting up the United Nations reflected a broad knowledge and experience in world problems.[30] Stevenson's varied and protracted efforts to get the United Nations started was one of the few effective accomplishments of U. S. diplomacy since World War II.[31] Cognizant of the failure of the "Wilsonian Dream," the League of Nations, he felt the need for an effective system of international law to govern nations and effect collective security.[32]

Stevenson's greatest fear was a retrogression to isolationism. His speeches are replete with statements of ideas relative to the dichotomous problem of internationalism vs. isolationism. Speaking as Governor of Illinois he stated: "...the reemergence of the straight isolationist doctrine--the same people saying the same things we heard before the whirlwind a decade ago--is to me the great regurgitation."[33]

---

[30] Busch, op. cit., pp. 76-77.

[31] Loc. cit.

[32] For additional information pertaining to the preparations and provisions of the United Nations as an instrument for promoting world peace. Norman Hill, Readings in International Relations (New York: Oxford University Press) pp. 61-95.

[33] "Northwestern University Founders Day Address," Vital Speeches, 17:284-288, February 15, 1951.

In an address entitled "No Safety in Isolation," he further annunciated his fear of "retrogressive isolationism.":

> ...We know there is no safety in solitude; we can't go it alone; there is no short cut, no cheap, no painless way to the great goal of peace. The people know, better, I suspect, than some politicians, that there is only one way--the slow, patient, steadfast, hard way ...[34]

VI. SPEECH PREMISES

In the 1952 presidential campaign Stevenson posited his arguments on several basic postulations which were used consistently even at the sacrifice of arguments better suited to the audience situation. Although on most issues he conformed closely with the platform of the Democratic Party, on occasions he failed to compromise his own position.

Stevenson's basic thinking on government, economics, and social problems is well developed.[35] His speech premises are closely related to the basic assumptions previously discussed and are the synthesis of many related ideas on the issues of the day. His thinking as it relates to the basic problems of the period encompassing the 1952

---

[34] "Address at the dedication of the Kiwanee, Illinois Armory, April 19, 1959," Public Statements, op. cit., p. 10.

[35] Ernest K. Lindley, "Impressions of Stevenson," Newsweek, 39:32, April 14, 1952.

campaign is set forth in his public addresses preceding it and a review of the major premises forms a basis for testing the consistency and the integrity of his ideas as they relate to the most important issues of the time.

Local, State and National Government. Essentially, Stevenson's philosophy of government can be summarized as follows:[36] A bedrock idea that underlay a great many of Stevenson's measures as Governor of Illinois was that the foundation of American Society is the local community and that concomitantly, the local community must accept responsibility.[37] As Governor he often spoke of "states' rights" and "states' wrongs." He conceived the states as a fulcrum balancing a teetertotter at one end of which sits the Federal Government and the other end of which sits the local community, which is often seriously neglected by the citizens. Apathy toward state and local government leads to national hegonomy. He dreaded concentration of Federal power in an almost Jeffersonian way.[38] As a devotee of decentralization of authority, he considered the state and local authority a bulwark against big government. In 1952 Stevenson wrote: "...I look upon the states as having in-

---

36 "Address delivered at Illinois State Fair," Springfield, Illinois, August 14, 1952, "States Duty to Stem Tide of Federal Centralization," Vital Speeches, Vol. XVIII, September 1, 1952, p. 675.

37 Martin, op. cit., p. 108.

38 Loc. cit.

creasingly critical importance. They represent one of the dikes with which we can build more strongly against the flood waters sweeping towards the District of Columbia.[39]

He continued his discourse by citing the dangers of overcentralization by averring that constitutional authority is the fountainhead of Federal-State relations.

> The latent distrust we Americans have for big government has its roots deep in our history. It caused the first Congress of the United States promptly and successfully to initiate an amendment of our infant constitution by the addition of Article X, with its explicit injunction that all powers not expressly delegated to the Federal Government remain with the states and with the people.[40]

The function of state and local communities are those which provide for local expression and more directly impinge on the needs of the people. These functions are too often taken for granted. What do they do, and more significantly, what can they keep on doing better and better so that there will arise no demand that Washington step in and take over?

> Schools, roads and hospitals are all of a piece and there are many more. Good, honest, skilled and dedicated state governments can do the job, do it best and protect some really fundamental values in the American scheme of things.[41]

---

39 "The States: Bulward Against 'Big Government,'" Look, June 3, 1952, p. 12.

40 Loc. cit.

41 Loc. cit.

Stevenson's allusion to states' wrongs is as significant as his views on states' rights. He averred that it is the failure of state and local governments to assert their indigenous function that creates over-centralization of Federal Government. Stevenson continued his dissertation as follows:

> While the states come first; while the states are the creators, not the creatures of Federal Government; while the viability of the Federal system depends on the states, the assertion of states' rights seems to me frequently less profitable than the acknowledgment of states' wrongs...[42]

Stevenson concluded with an assertion that balance between federal and state governments is needed to assure the best interests of all in a free society:

> I have learned that there is work to be done in our state capitols--important and rewarding work. I believe that to do it well...affords us the only hope for a proper degree of balance in our federalism.[43]

As a presidential candidate, Stevenson continued to enunciate a doctrine of states' responsibility. In an address to the New York State Democratic Convention[44] he affirmed his belief in strong state and local administration:

---

[42] Loc. cit.

[43] Loc. cit.

[44] "Address before the New York State Democratic Convention, August 29, 1952," Public Statements, p. 9.

"I believe...that affirmative state government can rise to meet many pressing social problems..." Stevenson reaffirmed, as he had done as Governor of Illinois, his belief in the clear and separate functions of state government:

> ...In the case of equal opportunity for employment, I believe that it is not alone the duty but the enlightened interest of each state to develop its own positive employment practices program--a program adapted to local conditions, emphasizing education and conciliation, and providing for judicial enforcement ...I think--indeed I know--there are leaders in the South who are just as anxious as we are to move ahead.

Referring to the 1952 National Democratic Platform, Stevenson attempts reconciliation between his views and the platform to which he was previously committed:[45]

> But we must frankly recognize their (the states') difficulties. We must recognize too that further government interference with free men, free markets, free ideas is distasteful to many people of good will who dislike racial discrimination as much as we do.... But our platform also favors federal legislation--particularly, I assume, when the states fail to act and inequalities of treatment persist...[46]

State and local responsibility is the capstone of democracy. "States' wrongs" is the tendency to abdicate authority:

---

[45] Adlai E. Stevenson, "I accept your nomination and your program." "Speech of Acceptance, Democratic National Convention, Chicago, Illinois, July 26, 1952," The Major Campaign Speeches of 1952, p. 7, (hereafter referred to as Major Campaign Speeches.)

[46] Quotation in Public Statements, op. cit., p. 10.

> I deplore the concentration of power in Washington, not because Washington wants it, but because the states have defaulted....I don't think we should contribute by our failure...to the further centralization and growth of Federal Government that is already so big it is almost unmanageable.[47]

Stevenson interpreted the states as the source of sovereignity; the creators, not the created. The Federal Government was brought into being by them to serve their ends--not as an end in itself.[48] Not only are the states the source of government, the creators, not the created, but the states are also the substructure of our Republic:

> Our republic can be no better, no stronger than the states which comprise it; our states no better, no stronger than their local communities. The whole can be no stronger than the people it governs.[49]

Speaking on the Limit of Government Controls, Stevenson attempted definition of the basic problem as regards the limit of federal powers. The problem of the day concerned how far government should go to attain the economic and social atmosphere in which the utmost individual freedom can exist. How far must government impair some individual freedom to preserve more? Stevenson argued that no one wants government to control every detail of human life.

---

[47] Radio report to the people of Illinois, January 10, 1952, Public Statements, p. 13.

[48] "Address before Philadelphia Bulletin Forum," March 22, 1950, Public Statements, p. 12.

[49] Loc. cit.

Conversely, he stated: "...anyone who talks of a return to the good old days when government acted only as a policeman is on his way to a museum..."[50] Lastly, he summarized the problem as "...between those who want government to do more at once and those who counsel caution lest we lose more of the Jeffersonian ideals of individual supremacy than we save."[51] In defense of the social revolutions wrought by twenty years of democratic rule, Stevenson attempted to define the limits to which government may transgress upon individual freedom. Using an historical analogy: "...the things that are God's and the things that are Caesar's..." in a tight logical argument he attempted reconciliation of his own viewpoint with that of the democratic platform:

> The mind is the expression of the soul, which belongs to God, and must be let alone by government. But farm prices, minimum wages, old age pensions, the regulation of monopoly, the physical safety of society--these things are Caesar's province, wherein the government should do all that is humanly possible.[52]

---

[50] "Address before New York Herald Tribune Forum," October 24, 1949, Public Statements, p. 14.

[51] "Address at Kasson, Minn.," September 6, 1952, Public Statements, p. 15.

[52] "Address at Salt Lake City, October 14, 1952," "Liberty of Conscience," U.S. News and World Report, Vol. 33, October 24, 1952, p. 100.

Foreign affairs. Foreign affairs was the subject of Stevenson's most important speeches and writings.

Stevenson's views on foreign policy are clearly documents by over fifty speeches dating back to the middle 1930's. For the purpose of this analysis, his speech premises need only be examined in light of the campaign issues and trends.

Stevenson matured in an era of broad decision. He bore witness to the failure of an isolationist doctrine to deter the advancement of two world wars. He quickly became a spokesman of the "interventionists" and was identified with the doctrines of "collective security," "internationalism," as opposed to pre-World War II isolationism.

Stevenson believed that a prerequisite for gaining perspective on American Foreign Policy was gaining a view of America's position in the world. This, he indicated in a few words.

> America's interests, power and responsibilities are world wide. Alongside this, is set two basic facts which are revealed in full view of foreign policy. One is that a world-wide imperialist war is now being carried on by the Soviet Union and its communist satellites. The other is the existence of a world-wide organization of states "united in strength to maintain international peace and security"--the United Nations.[53]

---

[53]Adlai E. Stevenson, "Korea in Perspective," Foreign Affairs, 30:349-60, April 1952.

The democratic presidential candidate's most important pronouncement was set forth in a speech in San Francisco during the 1952 campaign.[54] Speaking in the Veterans Memorial Auditorium on a hot September evening, his pronouncement became the nexus of his major declarations past and future, and was to remain the most important declaration on foreign policy of his public career.

"Victory or defeat for a nation," said Stevenson, "springs, first of all, from its attitudes toward the world."[55] Around this orbit of thought evolves a synthesis of ideas. These he outlined clearly and cohesively:

> America is threatened as never before. The question history asks...is whether the idea of individualism ...is equal to the idea of collectivism--the idea of personal subordination to the state; whether the idea of maximum personal liberty is equal to the idea of maximum personal discipline...[56]

The statement continues in simple and comprehensive terms: "This ancient contest between freedom and despotism, which is renewed in every generation, is acute in ours."

The argument that war need not be an inevitable part of this contest is used as a major premise:

---

[54] "Address on World Policy, San Francisco, California, September 9, 1952," Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit. pp. 91-99.

[55] Loc. cit.

[56] Ibid., p. 94.

> Even the most ambitious and ruthless men do not deliberately invite destruction of the basis of their power.[57] We who are free must have great strength in order that weakness will not tempt the ambitions, and the measure of strength we must have is not what we would like to afford but what the adversary compels us to afford.

Stevenson reflected an honest appraisal of what he thought was the probability of peace through the "peaceful purpose of power." "...noone can predict how and when our peaceful purpose...will succeed in creating a just and durable peace..."[58]

He spoke of "co-existence" as not a form of passive acceptance, but as a contest between freedom and tyranny by peaceful means. It will involve negotiation and adjustment--compromise but not appeasement..." He cited the "Marshall Plan" and the "North Atlantic Treaty Organization" as examples of "peace through power." Regarding Asia, he spoke of the factors involved in the problematic situation.

> The causes behind the upheaval are many and varied. But there is nothing complicated about what the people want. They want a decent living--and they want freedom.[59] Nationalism to Asians means a chance to... govern themselves....Nationalism to them means the end of legalized inferiority...

The strategy of communism in Asia is to pose as the

---

[57] Loc. cit.

[58] Ibid., p. 94.

[59] Ibid., p. 95.

> champion--the only champion--of the Asian peoples. Communism has not created the cause or the forces behind Asia's vast upheaval. It is attempting to give directions to those forces...when we think of communism, we think of what we are going to lose. When many of the Asiatics think of communism they think of what they are going to gain...[60]

The communists expectation by themselves define the dimensions of the threat in Asia and of the tasks which lie ahead. "...tasks which can be met only by disciplined, resourceful, imaginative and reasoned efforts. It is an effort which has two parts: defense and development." As an example, Stevenson pointed to Korea as a long step toward building a security system in Asia:

> As an American I am proud that we had the courage to resist ruthless, cynical aggression, and I am equally proud that we had the fortitude to refuse to risk extension of that war despite extreme communist provocation and reckless Republican criticism.[61]

He spoke of Korea as the defensive shield behind which we had the opportunity to assist in the great task of development.[62] Stevenson's position in the debate over China was along party lines.

> "...the very Congressmen whose vocal cords were most active in the cause of isolation and against foreign entanglements were the same ones who are now talking as if they had wanted to take part in the civil war in China.

---

[60] Ibid., p. 96.

[61] Ibid., p. 97.

[62] Ibid., p. 96.

In summary, Stevenson defines the answer to the communists as "good works--good works inspired by love and dedicated to the whole man." The answer to the inhumanity of communism is humane respect for the individual...[63]

In the epilogue Stevenson refers to internationalism as the answer to world peace.

> If we believe the communist threat to Asia is dangerous to us, it is in our own self-interest to help them (the free countries) defend and develop....Some say this is visionary stuff. To this I reply that history has shown...that the self-styled realists are the real visionaries--for their eyes are fixed on the past that cannot be recaptured.[64]

As he had done in numerous occasions Stevenson referred to the "Wilsonian Dream": "It was Woodrow Wilson, with his dream of the League of Nations, who was the truly practical man--not the old guard who fought him to the death..."[65]

It is important that some consideration be given Stevenson's views on foreign policy aside from those incorporated within the framework of campaign speeches. Lindley,[66] previous to the 1952 campaign referred to Stevenson as not the sort of partisan who thinks that the nation would

---

[63] Ibid., p. 98.

[64] Loc. cit.

[65] Ibid., p. 99.

[66] Ernest K. Lindley, op. cit., p. 41.

be doomed to ruin by the election of a middle-of-the-road Republican president provided that man were not an isolationist.

> He would do his utmost to defeat a man who was not wholeheartedly committed to the support and strengthening of our overseas alliances and to the collective action against aggression. The questions of foreign policy and defense are matters of life and death--on the other hand mistakes and omissions in the realm of domestic policy are rarely fatal and can be repaired. Stevenson moreover thinks a good many things in Washington need straightening out.

Taxes, spending and inflation. Stevenson attempted definition of the problem as regards taxes, spending and inflation as early as 1949.

Speaking as Governor of Illinois he approached the issue by declaring, "Our two dread enemies (are) Russia and taxes."[67] Stevenson's major task was the reorganization of the state budget with the objective of bringing the budget into balance.[68] "The most important need," he said, is to cut the cost of government..." Cognizant of the urgency of the problem, he gleaned every opportunity to state his views. In an address before the American Public

---

[67] "Address before the Inland Daily Press Association, October 19, 1949," in Public Statements.

[68] Noel Busch, Adlai Stevenson of Illinois, p. 102.

Welfare Association he declared:

> Confronted with an enormous increase in the federal budget, the preoccupation of the whole country today has become the cost of government....Money will be harder and harder to get to maintain, let alone expand state services....Can we do more for less? I know we must. I think we can.[69]

On another occasion Stevenson expressed his concern for careless spending by government in caustic terms:

> Carelessness with public funds is intolerable at any time, let alone in times of full employment like these. We need the help of labor unions as much as taxpayer's associations to see that the public dollar is spent as economically and as efficiently as possible.[70]

As a presidential candidate, Stevenson continued to disdain government spending and to define what he thought to be the causes of inflation.

In a speech at Baltimore, the presidential candidate outlined four recommendations for the prevention of inflation:

> First, curbing of unnecessary governmental expenses. "This is going to mean a strict auditing of every payroll in the government and slashing of every piece of administrative fat....Second, a pay-as you go tax standard." ...We must spend to be safe and taxes are better than inflation.... Third, the prevention of excessive borrowing...for that can be just as expensive as excessive government borrowing.... Fourth,

---

[69] "Address before American Public Welfare Association, Chicago, Illinois, December 1, 1950," Public Statements, p. 13.

[70] "Address before C.I.O. Convention,Chicago, Illinois, November 20, 1950," Public Statements, p. 10.

> direct controls on prices, wages and rent....I don't like them...but if the alternative is a steady rise in our food, clothing, rent and other living costs, then we must have them...[71]

The fifth premise pertains to the elimination of duplicate governmental functions. The preoccupation of the whole country was and should be the cost of government. In an address before the Philadelphia Bulletin Forum, he declared:

> Today there is scarcely an important problem that is not dealt with by two, and often three levels of government. We must root out unnecessary duplications in federal, state, and local services.[72]

Social Welfare. Stevenson's views on social welfare were not the liberal democratic, stereotype of the 1930-40 period. His speeches during this period indicated an ascription to the New Freedom and the New Deal philosophy with respect to the final repudiation of laissez faire and the explicit recognition of government as a social welfare agency.[73] On March 31, 1949, Stevenson stated:

> Our party has succeeded when it has had national leaders who saw through the hypocrisy of small, privileged groups opposing any and all changes on the ground that confidence must not be shaken. They un-

---

71 "The Control of Inflation--Address at Baltimore, Maryland," Major Campaign Speeches, September 23, 1952, pp. 165-167.

72 "Address before the Philadelphia Bulletin Forum, March 22, 1950," Public Statements, p. 6.

73 Henry Steele Commanger, The American Mind (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952), p. 338.

> masked the selfishness and the greed of groups who wanted government always to stand still, who wanted nothing done for public welfare if it disturbed the status quo.[74]

That Stevenson was dutifully concerned about problems of social welfare is attested by the following statement:

> The great challenge of our generation is not to despair because we face tremendous social problems, but rather to face them and overcome them.[75]

Stevenson's views on public welfare "encompassed" the recognition of government as an agent of social welfare. The extent to which government should assume this roll is defined as follows:[76]

> The term "security" has been a part of our official jargon for so long that I am afraid that many of us have not fully sensed some of the dangers in the security ideal as it has developed.[77]

Governmental responsibility, he stated, should exist only...when the family and the individual have exerted every effort and then, because of unavoidable circumstances, have not been able to maintain a decent standard of existence.

> ...Government through its public assistance and social welfare programs, should seek to enhance, not supplant

---

[74] "Address at Jefferson-Jackson Dinner, Springfield, Illinois, March 31, 1949," Public Statements.

[75] Loc. cit.

[76] "Address before American Public Welfare Association, Chicago, Illinois, December 1, 1950," Public Statements.

[77] "Address at Peoria State Hospital, Peoria, Illinois, October 8, 1951," Public Statements.

> the duty of the individual and of the family to provide for their own health and welfare.[78]

Stevenson recognized the necessity of private enterprise assuming responsibility for the health and welfare of their employees as a means of expostulating governmental interference in these areas. In an address before the Illinois State C.I.O. Convention he called upon private enterprise to assist in the economic security of their workers and minority groups. "Such a program, he declared, "would be the best kind of public relations business could devise....Private enterprise committed to such a program would have little to fear from the blandishments of socialism and communism."[79]

Religion and education. Stevenson's belief in the inviolability of educational and religious institutions forms the basis for many of the speech premises. In their broadest application they can be placed in five groups: Education for Democratic Living, Views on Academic Freedom, the Dangers of Police State Methods, Views on the Subsidizing of Higher Education, and Religious Faith.

The importance of schools in a democracy was stressed. On several speaking occasions as Governor of Illinois, he

---

[78] Peoria State Hospital Address, Public Statements.

[79] "Address before the Illinois State C.I.O. Convention, Chicago, Illinois, December 9, 1949," Public Statements, p. 10.

proclaimed: "If we have any greater responsibility than giving our boys and girls a good common school education I don't know what it is."[80]

In an address to the Chicago Teachers Union he defined the importance of Education for democratic living as the perpetuation of our democratic faith.

> America will not be saved by armed strength and material production....The conflict that divides the world today is a conflict of ideologies of values, of ultimate goals. We will win only if our democratic faith is profound and passionate.[81]

The perpetuation of our "democratic faith" according to Stevenson was posited on a principle of academic freedom. He believed the promulgation of this doctrine depended on watchful vigilance lest the attacks on our educational institutions destroy them. In acrid tones he declared in an address commenorating Founders Day at Northwestern University:

> The spirit of free inquiry and fearless scholarship ...is a basic condition of free men....The guardians of Western thought (must) never permit its vitality and beauty to be smothered by strong, arrogant men who burn books and bend though to their liking nor obscured by timid men trembling in the darkness of anxiety.[82]

---

[80] Radio Report to the People of Illinois, May 23, 1949, p. 4.

[81] "Address before the Chicago Teachers Union, March 22, 1952," Public Statements (hereafter referred to as Teachers Union Speech.)

[82] Adlai E. Stevenson, Founders Day Speech, op. cit. p. 284.

Following a wave of national hysteria in which many states enacted legislation requiring loyalty oaths for all public employees, Illinois not excluded, Stevenson spoke in opposition to what he considered a dangerous trend in American thinking:[83]

> We must face the danger that misguided or malicious zealots may reach into our schools with gag rules, loyalty oaths, censorship of texts and teaching methods, and even restraints on freedom of speech. These are the harbingers of hysteria, the paraphenalia of the police state.

Referring to recent attacks on educators and educational institutions he declared:[84]

> Personal attacks on educators, rumors and innuendos about teachers, hasty and unfair charges against textbooks and even vicious slanders against reputable educational organizations have recently been made.[85]

In describing such attacks as police state methods, the following premise was used:

> The attacks indicate that some persons are willing to use...irresponsible accusation and guilt by association...to injure, subvert, even to destroy, albeit unconsciously, our great system of public education.[86]

As a counterbalance to the growing trend toward police state methods he asserted: "...schools must do better than they have ever done in preparing our young people to work, to vote, to live in a free society."[87]

---

83 "Veto Message of the 1951 Illinois Legislative session, Senate Bill No. 102."

84 "Teachers Union Speech," op. cit., p. 14.

85 Loc. cit.

86 Loc. cit.

87 Loc. cit.

Stevenson spoke often on the subject of education; on the need for giving top priority to what he termed "good common school education." It is not clear, to what extent he believed local and state government should assume responsibility for free common school education. He did indicate, however, his disapproval of governmental subsidy of higher education. Referring to Northwestern University, he stated:

> By virtue of their very independence (privately endowed institutions) are indispensable to the kind of survival we are all talking about....It will be an ominous day indeed when all higher education is government subsidized.[88]

The schools, declared Stevenson, are the basis of our democratic society. Democracy, he believed, depended on education for democratic living. He made this premise clear in his Chicago Teachers Union Speech when he stated:

> ...Democracy must be taught and practiced and preached and lived--and the schools occupy the focal point of this task.[89]

Stevenson's Calvinist background gave impressive evidence to his thinking on religion. Religious faith, he defined as the "shield and the sword" of America's power:

---

[88] Radio Report to the people of Illinois, May 23, 1949, Public Statements, op. cit.

[89] Teachers' Union Speech, op. cit., p. 12.

"In the tense struggle for peace...the mighty and mightily neglected power of the verities of religious faith is our shield and sword."

His religious philosophy was lucid and incisive. It adjured practical application to the social problem of our day. This, he interpreted as the "moral and material" crises of our time.[90] He spoke of seeking the intransitory--the enduring as an alternative to the transitory or the less enduring: It seemed to him a sad commentary on contemporary and public life..."that we are so busy with so much that is transitory we give all too little to the intransitory and enduring...truth lies in reflection and meditation."[91]

Labor. Stevenson's views on labor problems reflected the traditional democratic party platform which, with limited reservations, subscribed to a principle of labor's right to bargain collectively with employers through representatives of their own choosing. Protected by the Wagner-Connery Labor Relations Act of 1936,[92] the power of labor unions increased until the enactment of the Taft-Harley Act

---

[90] "Address at dedication of Temple Brth Israel, Chicago, December 2, 1951," Public Statements, op. cit.

[91] Loc. cit.

[92] John D. Hicks, A Short History of the American Democracy (Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1946), p. 748.

of 1947. Against the backdrop of anti-labor sentiment he expounded a philosophy of "labor statesmanship."

Stevenson's use of the term statesmanship was unique in labor-management relations. In an address before the C.I.O. Constitutional Convention, Stevenson stated " labor must set an example for all to see."[93] "Statesmanship," he continued, "is no longer the peculiar art of public officials or of diplomats...it is the necessary responsibility of all. It must be practiced in every segment of our society--and no where more than in the area of organized labor."[94]

On the problems of labor in government, Stevenson's views are consistent. He warned labor against seeking special privileges from government.

> Public employers cannot...maintain fair and effective employment relations with all public servants if union members insist on preferred treatment through threats of political reprisals or strikes against essential public services...proper, fair wages and working conditions, yes; special privileges for labor in services of the public to win votes,no.[95]

Before the Illinois A. F. of L. Executive Council, Stevenson laid down a guiding principle for Labor's responsibility in our American Society. There was a time,

---

[93] "Address before the C.I.O. Convention, Chicago, Illinois, November 20, 1950," Public Statements., op. cit.

[94] Loc.cit.

[95] Loc. cit.

he proclaimed, when it looked upon itself as an embattled minority. "but...now it [labor] must see itself as a large and strategic part of our whole economic picture."[96]

The most important labor issue of the 1952 presidential campaign was the proposed repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. On September 1, 1952, he stated the reasons for proposing a revision of federal labor statutes by declaring: "The only legitimate purpose of federal labor relations laws is to make private collective bargaining work better." In the 1952 Labor Day address, Stevenson cited two major premises: (1) The Taft-Hartley Act was not a "slave labor" law; (2) it was politically inspired and has not improved labor relations in a single plant. Stevenson proposed five general principles as the basis for a new labor relations law..."I believe," said Stevenson, "they represent the public interest in a fair, durable pattern of free collective bargaining..." They were as follows: (1) The law must accept labor unions as responsible representatives of their members interests; (2) If labor unions are to be accepted as the full representatives and guardians of employees interests in the bargaining process, then labor unions must conform to standards

---

[96] "Address before A. F. L. Executive Council, Chicago, Illinois, August 10, 1950," Public Statements, op. cit.

of fair conduct; (3) The new federal labor law must outlaw unfair bargaining practices by companies or unions; (4) Rejection of the labor injunction; (5) New methods must be found for settling national emergency disputes.[97]

In effect, Stevenson's basic ideas and speech premises emphasized labor's responsibility in a democratic society. "Labor," he declared, "has come of age and with its hard won...power and influence in the social, economic and political life of the country has come the responsibility of its full and mighty manhood.[98]

Housing. While housing continued to be a major problem affecting to a great degree, the economic and social well being of the nation, it did not emerge as a vital issue of the period. The housing shortage remained acute during the decade preceding the 1952 campaign, but was not used as a campaign issue by the Republican Party. It continued, however, to affect the political climate on regional levels. The issue seemed to remain one of public vs. private participation in such enterprises as slum clearance, rural and suburban housing construction. On this issue,

---

[97] "Labor Day Address, Detroit, Michigan, September 1, 1952," Public Statements, op. cit.

[98] "Address before A. F. of L. Executive Council, Chicago, Illinois, August 10, 1950," Public Statement, op. cit., p. 9.

Stevenson again displayed an agility for taking the "middle ground" approach. His appeal was for cooperation between private and public agencies..."no single group, public or private, can do the job....Only a direct, bold and sustained drive by all segments of the public, by all agencies of the local community, the state, and the federal government, can do it."[99]

Recognizing the housing shortage as an acute problem, he proclaimed it the outstanding paradox of our advanced age. In his 1949 gubernatorial inaugural address, he stated: "The outstanding paradox...is the persistence of an acute shortage of the most elemental requirement of mankind--shelter--in a nation which beyond all others is the wealthiest, most productive and most resourceful..." It was Stevenson's belief that the problem was one for private enterprise, but that they were unable to do the job at costs within reach of those most in need. "The combined resources of national, state and local governments are necessary for the solution to this problem."[100]

---

[99] "Address at Illinois Housing Day Banquet, Chicago, Illinois, March 14, 1950," Public Statements, op. cit.

[100] "Inaugural Address at Springfield, Illinois, January 10, 1949," Chicago Tribune, 108:5, January 11, 1949.

Internal security. Stevenson's belief in the danger of the communist menace formed the basic premise of his major speeches on communism. As early as 1951, Stevenson recognized its danger through arrogating its importance beyond that of Fascism, Kaiserism and Nazism. "Communism," he declared, "is far more dangerous than all our familiar authoritarian enemies...because communism is the corruption of a dream of justice."[101] In analyzing the short term and long term effects of the communist menace he used as his basic premise the inability of communism to resolve the anxieties of the world. In a tightly reasoned syllogism, he offered the following logical proof: Anxieties can only be cured by basic security through spiritual content and comfort. "Communism resolves no anxieties. It multiplies them. It organizes terror. It is without spiritual content....It provides no basic security. In the long run it cannot cure the disease of this anxious age."[102]

As time and events decreed, the issue of communism's internal and external threat to the security of the United States colored the political horizon. In 1952, when it

---

[101] "A Corrupt Dream," address at University of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois, June 15, 1951, Chicago Tribune, June 16, 1951, p. 10.

[102] "Northwestern University Founders' Day Address," Vital Speeches, Vol. XVII, February 15, 1951, pp. 284-288.

became apparent that the campaign would be won or lost in accordance with the treatment of the issue in political debate, he restated his fears of the communist menace. "We are confronted with international conspiracy," he said, "we need at home and abroad to take measures to protect ourselves against it." Recognizing the problem of communism in government to be a real one he stated, "We have driven communists out of any places of responsibility--we will expose and identify them at every step along the way. WE WILL NOT PERMIT THEM TO RETURN."[103]

How should our internal security be effected? Stevenson believed the effectiveness of a program to defeat communism must be aimed at disproving the ideas upon which communist doctrine is predicated. "The point is, we've got to fight communism, not communists...We've got to see to it that the soil is so healthy that communism can't grow or survive in it, and that means...assuring good jobs, decent homes, good education and free political institutions."[104]

---

103 "The American Future," Los Angeles, September 11, 1952, Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., p. 152.

104 "Speech entitled 'Proud of Accomplishments'" in Illinois delivered at Chicago, Illinois, September 29, 1952, Vital Speeches, Vol. 19, October 15, 1952. Pp. 5-8.

Farm policy. Stevenson made no noteworthy pronouncements on farm policy preceding his ascension to the presidential nomination. His basic thinking on farm issues previous to the 1952 presidential campaign is not clear.

The farm policy issue, however, remained important throughout the Truman administration. Knowing that there was no alternative, albeit, to subscribe to the policy of the Truman administration, Stevenson accepted the democratic farm policy platform and campaigned for it with vigor and conviction. His acceptance was an unequivocal reaffirmation of the democratic policy of farm price supports.

> "....We of this generation, who saw farm conditions at their worst in 1932, have had the happy privilege of seeing them over the last decade at their best... I am running on the Democratic platform. I believe its agriculture plank is clear. I stand on it without squirming.[105] I feel no need to modify this provision...

The Democratic National Platform pledged a continuation of the mandatory price support program of not less than 90 per cent of parity.[106]

Stevenson reaffirmed the Democratic platform in a speech celebrating the National Plowing Contest, September 6,

---

105 "Address at Kasson, Minnesota, September 6, 1952," Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., pp. 64-65

106 Cf. Democratic National Committee, The 1952 Democratic Platform, pp. 22-23.

1952. Through the use of a deductive line of argument he stated: [major premise] "I know that the American farmers do not want...anything more than what is justified by the larger good of the commonwealth... [minor premise] Farmers, like other citizens are entitled to a fair return for their labor and a fair chance in the world for their children...

third The way we have chosen to maintain farm income is to support farm prices. Our platform lays this out in clear language. Here is what it says: 'We will continue to protect the producers of basic agriculture commodities under terms of a mandatory price support program of not less than 90 per cent of parity.'"[107]

---

[107] "Address at Kasson, Minnesota," Major Campaign Speeches, loc. cit.

CHAPTER IV

1952 POLITICAL TRENDS

The collective audience to which Mr. Stevenson spoke in the 1952 Presidential campaign was a "product" of several important trends. Although it is impossible to determine which were most decisive in influencing the course of the campaign he safely concluded that several issues were of sufficient prominence to be of rhetorical significance. It is not the purpose of this thesis to analyze the factors which influenced the trends, but to determine how the issues of the campaign were used in rhetorical invention.

Time for a change. The overriding trend was the growing demand for a change in governmental administration. The slogan, "Time for a change" found its inception in 1940 and was repeated in 1944, 1948 and in 1952 by the Republican opposition. Wyatt states: "...there was an irresistable force which no single issue and no single person or no combination of issues or persons could really have changed."[1] Taft stated, "...the dominant issue was getting rid of the New Deal--that is, the people were fundamentally against the whole...philosophy."[2]

---

[1] Post-election statement of Wilson V. Wyatt, Manager of Stevenson's Campaign in 'Interviews, Why We Won, and Why We Lost', U.S. News and World Report, 33:69, Nov. 14, 1952.

[2] Ibid., p. 66, Post election statement of Taft.

Dewey stated, "I think the American people wanted a clean sweep of the administration..."[3] It can be concluded, therefore that there were few genuine issues shaping the 1952 campaign trend, albeit, this overriding issue. It became incumbent upon the presidential candidates to create such trends. It was the onus of each aspirant to persuade the voter that the parties were divided on matters of principle.

The mess in Washington. The trend toward the desirability for a change in national administration found its precipitating causes in several issues, most of which were broadly coined by political propagandists as "The Mess in Washington." Stated in simple terms, they were the issues arising out of the complexities of the foreign and domestic problems of post war America.

A question of importance is what degree were the pre-election problems magnified by Stevenson's opponent, and also what degree did candidate Stevenson recognize their existence? Rhetorically, Stevenson did not give the same credence to the "mess" as did his opponent. Candidate Stevenson regarded the "mess" in Washington as limited to scandals, involving public officials, uncovered by a Democratic Congress. In a letter to an editor he stated: "As to whether I can clean up the mess in Washington, I would bespeak the careful scrutiny of what I inherited in

---

[3] Ibid., p. 68, Post election statement of T. E. Dewey.

Illinois and what has been accomplished in three years."[4]

Collectively, "the mess" was a compendium of trends. Singularly, they were individual issues arising out of many domestic and foreign problems. It is noteworthy that the issues to which the presidential candidates referred were brought to light by committees of Congress controlled by the Democratic party. It was a record centering mostly on the years since 1946 and was broad in scope. As previously noted, Stevenson chose to minimize the scope of these issues and it is of rhetorical significance to consider the effectiveness of this approach.

What were the trends, and were they of sufficient importance to constitute trends? The first important political trend was the trend in Asian policy. The United States for 52 years had insisted on an "open door" policy in China, culminating in a resistance to Japanese aggression between 1937 and 1945, which produced 325,000 casualties. Dollar costs exceeded 100 billion dollars. However, within four years after the costly war China had been lost to Communism. Such a loss had been described as without parallel in history. A committee of Congress, headed by Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada, a Democrat, concluded unanimously that

---

[4] Stevenson was referring to his cleanup that followed the scandal of a Republican Administration. Quoted in "What's the 'Washington Mess,'" U. S. News and World Report 33:11, September 19, 1952.

influence of communist sympathizers within the United States government shaped the policies that led to the loss of China.[5]

The Korean War provided the second important political trend. With the loss of China in 1949 the Joint Chiefs of Staffs unanimously decided to withdraw American occupation troops after having declared the area indefensible. "The defense perimeter," stated Dean Acheson, Secretary of State in 1950, "runs along the Aleutions to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus...from the Ryukyus to the Phillipine Islands....So far as the military security of other areas in the Pacific is concerned, it must be clear that no person can guarantee these areas against military attack."[6]

On June 25, 1950, the communists invaded Korea. At the inception of the 1952 campaign 117,000 Americans had been casualties.

The communist issue perhaps created the third most important trend imposed upon Mr. Stevenson during the 1952 campaign. Communism in government was disclosed by the official record to be a complicated problem. The American people were conditioned to a trend related to a turbulent foreign problem. It is doubtful that a genuine communist

---

[5] Ibid., p. 12.

[6] "What's the Washington Mess," ibid., p. 14.

issue existed. According to President Harry S.Truman, the whole issue was a "red herring" to detract attention from Congress's failure to act against inflation.[7]

The house Un-American Affairs Committee, however, uncovered Alger Hiss who was convicted of purgery for saying that he had not turned over secret State Department documents to the communists.[8]

Also of importance in the communist issue were the findings of the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission appointed by President Truman. These findings concluded that the State Department had the worst record of any department in the action of its board.

Communists in high places in governmental authority were depicted through such admitted communists as Leo Pressman, a one-time government official then general counsel of the Congress of Industrial Organization. Other officials were referred to in investigations as party members of party officials. Court trials showed a network of communist spies operative throughout the United States.[9]

An outgrowth of the post-war fear of communism was the development of a veritable trend known as "McCarthyism."

---

[7] Ibid., p. 15.

[8] Loc. cit.

[9] Ibid., p. 86.

It was given impetus by the governmental investigations previously discussed.[10] The fear of communists in high places of governmental responsibility carried some validity, for in the immediate period preceding the 1952 campaign it had become a major issue, and with it a resistance movement which had as its leader Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republic from Wisconsin. Immediately McCarthy became the focal point of a controversy which tended to obscure the more important issues of the campaign.

Rhetorically, "McCarthyism" had a manifold purpose and meaning. Its putative definition was expressed by a leading news magazine as a symbol of widespread fear of communist infiltration of the government and a growing force of nationalism. The expression, "McCarthyism," was added to the English language as a result of the controversial political methods used by Senator McCarthy in his double condemnation of communism and the Democratic Administration.[11]

The importance of McCarthyism as a political trend was attested by his decisive victory in the 1952 primary elections. Emerging as a political force of great importance McCarthy portended a trend validated in part by a mandate from the voters

---

[10] Cf. ante. p. 75.

[11] "What's McCarthyism," U.S. News and World Report, 33:16, September 26, 1952.

of the state of Wisconsin.[12] Clearly a political issue, McCarthyism represented a formidable trend in public opinion and served to substantiate the Republican contention that it was "time for a change in Washington."

An important political trend centered about the scandals which racked the Democratic Administration in the months preceding the 1952 campaigns. These may be grouped into three major classifications: The "five percenter" scandals, the opprobrium attached to the tax frauds within the Internal Revenue Commission, and The Reconstruction Finance Corporation frauds.[13]

The American people in the spring of 1951 were shocked to learn that within the administrative "houte monde," influence was alleged to have been peddled for high fees. Favoritism in government contracts were charged by opponents of the administration, although most facts were disclosed by a congressional committee headed by a Democrat, Senator Clyde R. Hoey of North Carolina.[14]

---

[12] In the 1952 Wisconsin Primary, McCarthy brought to the polls nearly one million voters--a record for a Wisconsin primary. He defeated his main Republican opponent by 536,772 to 210,092 or nearly 3 to 1. "McCarthyism, Is It a Trend," loc. cit.

[13] Loc. cit.

[14] The U.S. Commission of Internal Revenue from 1944 to 1947, whose official salary was $10,000 a year, was shown to have unreported income of $176,000 over 7 years. Also, in a 12-month period report ending June 30, 1952, Treasury Dept. listed 174 employees dismissed-53 for bribes, 24 for embezzlement.

The tax frauds within the administration brought into perspective the most serious weaknesses of the Truman administration. Although the first exposures were made by a Republican, Senator John J. Williams of Delaware, a congressional committee headed by Representative Cecil R. King, Democrat from California, made a comprehensive investigation of this most serious of all administrative scandals.[15] Facing the Truman Administration at the close of the second term was a growing revolt amongst the southern conservatives of the Democratic party. The revolt which had been stirring for the greater part of the post war era was given new impetus through the issue of federal domination,[16] which was closely related to the broad problem of states' rights.

The first issue was the civil-rights controversy which had been a major factor in the formation of the Dixiecrat party in 1948. In brief it stemmed from the plans of the Truman Administration to enact a series of Federal laws designed to eliminate discrimination engendered by race, religion or national origin. Inasmuch as the program purported to project the Federal Government farther into the field which historically and legally had been regarded as a state domain, the result was a federal-state as well as

---

15 Loc. cit.

16 "The South in Revolt," U.S. News and World Report, 33:28, September 26, 1952.

a constitutional battle. The South, with its excessive Negro population, was solidly opposed.[17]

The revolt among traditional democrats in the southern states had its precipitating cause in the "Tidelands Oil" issue. Richly endowed off-shore-oil-states such as Texas and Louisiana found themselves openly opposed to the Truman Administration on this issue. Texas Governor Shivers declared Adlai Stevenson had turned his back on Texas claim to offshore oil reserves. Although the "Tidelands Oil" issue was not of importance to the rank-and-file voter, it was the focal point of a southern revolt. The Texas Democratic Convention, angered over this and other issues, called for all Democratic party workers to support General Eisenhower.

The Southern revolt was epitomized by a statement of James F. Byrnes of South Carolina in which he flayed the position of the Democratic candidate on the question of Fair Employment Practices:

> On the issue of the Fair Employment Practices Act, Governor Stevenson in the past expressed the opinion such legislation was a matter for States and not the Federal Government.[18]
>
> Now candidate Stevenson says while ordinarily he thinks it best to handle such questions within the states,

---

[17] "The Controversy in Congress over Federal 'Civil Rights' Proposals," Congressional Digest 29:21, February, 1950.

[18] Cf. ante., p. 32.

he favors compulsory federal legislation...should a state fail to enact an adequate state law...

Such coercion by the Federal Government would impair the sovereignity of the states....No Southern State would enact an F.E.P.C. law.[19]

---

[19] Statement of Governor James F. Byrnes in "Pro and Con of the Issues," U.S. News and World Report, op. cit., p. 96.

CHAPTER V

THE 1952 CAMPAIGN SPEECHES

I. THE AUDIENCE

The preceding analysis shows that Candidate Stevenson was facing, from the onset of the campaign, a collective audience conditioned to the need for a change in federal administration. The course of events of the four year period preceding the campaign had given the Republican party sufficient issues with which to effectively exploit this trend.

Thus the problem of constructing contra-arguments was intensified by a climate of opinion which favored the Republican philosophy.

It can be concluded that Mr. Stevenson and his staff were cognizant that the flow of public opinion was contrary to the "New-Deal" philosophy of the 1930 period. Schlesinger[1] states that Stevenson realized the weakness of the 1952 campaign was its reliance on the ideals and ideas of the mid 1930's. "He and his party had very little time for planning. Stevenson was running as the candidate of a party continuously in power since those days." The effectiveness with which Stevenson handled this situation is of concern to the rhetorical critic.

---

[1] Arthur A. Schlesinger, Jr., New York Times, November 2, 1952, p. 12.

In that Stevenson was pleading for election, his speeches were deliberative in character. According to Aristotelian classification, they were speeches of "exhortation and dissuasion."[2] Yet, as the campaign approached its end, the character of his speeches incorporated the use of forensic methods with deliberative ends inferred. Because he was running for election as a candidate of the in-party the defense of its record was unavoidable and became more the thesis of his argument as the campaign drew to a close.[3] The Republican opposition had attacked the inherent philosophy of the New-Deal, Fair-Deal dogma. Hence a defense of the record of the previous administration obviated any hope Stevenson might have had of avoiding identity with the Truman Administration.

According to Schlesinger a defense of the previous Democratic Administration's record was necessary, yet it would not have been enough even if Stevenson had won. As one of his closest advisors, Schlesinger stated: "...it was as mistaken to have carried the 1952 electorate back to the New-Deal as it would have been to have fought the 1932 election with praise of Woodrow Wilson's new-freedom."[4]

---

[2] Lane Cooper, The Rhetoric of Aristotle, op. cit., p. 17.

[3] Schlesinger, op. cit., p. 12.

[4] Loc. cit.

Thus it was the intention of Mr. Stevenson to retain throughout the campaign speeches of deliberative character. It was not a matter of what was to be attained so much as of the means of attaining it.

Stevenson's speech in defense of his court deposition on Alger Hiss,[5] however, is clearly forensic. The campaign speech considering "Safeguards against Communism" exemplifies the subordination of the deliberative elements to the forensic while stressing deliberative ends.[6] The speech on "Liberty of Conscience"[7] was clearly deliberative in character. Thus it can be assumed that Mr. Stevenson varied the method to fit the occasion and the audience for each of the three with the same topos, the achievement of peace and security with freedom and justice.

That it was Mr. Stevenson's desire to use the deliberative approach, though it became increasingly impossible as the campaign progressed, is indicated in the following statement by Wyatt:[8]

> ...I think Stevenson was campaigning in the future ....I think that the swing of the current of opinion... in the process before the convention...influenced cumu-

---

[5] "The Hiss Case," address given at Cleveland, Ohio, October 23, 1950, Major Campaign Speeches, p. 269.

[6] "Address at Detroit, Michigan, October 9, 1952, ibid., p. 213.

[7] "Address at Salt Lake City, Utah, October 14, 1952, ibid., p. 245.

[8] Post Election statement, op. cit., p. 69.

> lative resentments and a desire for quiet and peace from any further change....In that sense he was campaigning on the record...

It can be concluded that Stevenson was inextricably tied to the past. Having accepted the Democratic platform he was forced to defend its record--thus his campaign had become tinged with the forensic elements of accusation and defense, justic and injustice.

The overriding deliberative elements were exhortations concerning the destiny of America. These were powerful, masterful expositions of political philosophy pertinent to the needs of America. Stevenson classified them as follows: (1) How to stop Communist Aggression and prevent World War III; (2) How to build a more decent and rational democracy in a free society; (3) How to foster continued economic growth and a steady rising standard of living.[9]

Stevenson's speeches, both political and non-political, previous to the 1952 campaign were principally deliberative discourses in which he outlined broad philosophical principles.

His speeches of the 1952 campaign carry the same continuity of thought. The integrity of the ideas exposited during the campaign remained unchanged. As previously noted,

---

[9] "Basic Issues by the Two Candidates," New York Times, November 2, 1952, p. 9.

the propositions of the 1952 campaign extol a consistency in basic thinking on the important issues of the day.[10]

A question of importance is how Stevenson adapted the subject matter of his speeches to the various audiences while adhering to the issues. A partial answer lies in the objectives Stevenson outlined for the campaign.

The first objective was stated by the candidate as follows:

> ...in accepting the nomination...I viewed the campaign not as a crusade to exterminate the opposition, but as a great opportunity to educate and elevate a people whose destiny is leadership...[11]

His speech before the American Legion Convention attests to this objective. Speaking to veterans as a veteran, Stevenson expounded the nature of patriotism not as a "frenzied outburst of emotion but as the tranquil and steady dedication of a lifetime." He excoriated super-patriotism of veteran's groups and others who seek to equate the general welfare with their own special philosophy.

> ...I shall tell you--my fellow legionnaires--as I would tell all other organized groups, that I intend to resist pressure from veterans, too, if I think their demands are excess or in conflict with the public interest...[12]

---

[10] Cf. ante., Basic Assumptions p. 29.

[11] Autobiographic Sketch, Major Campaign Speeches, p. 24.

[12] "Address before the American Legion Convention, Madison Square Garden, New York City, August 27, 1952", Major Campaign Speeches, p. 19.

Stevenson did not subordinate his own ideas in an effort to dispose the audience favorably to him.

The second major conclusion is that Stevenson's addresses were not only aimed at the specific audience, but at the unseen millions of listeners and viewers and readers--the collective audience of American people, who, through the mass media of communication, were the judges of his campaign oratory. Murphy states, "Some of his more elevated radio talks seemed to be directed more to posterity than to the November electorate."[13]

Although Stevenson varied his basic ideas little during the campaign, the problem of audience adaptation was not ignored. An examination of the campaign speeches indicates a strong attempt to properly dispose the audience. He varied the thesis of each speech to fit the locale and the specific interests of the audience. The speech before the Labor Day rally in Detroit, Michigan, concerned the problem of improving labor laws. In Cheyenne, Wyoming, he spoke on the "New West." At Seattle, Washington, an area who's most important concern was the issue of public vs. private power development and conservation, his speech was entitled, "The People's Natural Resources."

---

[13] See Robert Murphy's first hand observation of Stevenson on the campaign train in "The Election: A Symposium," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. XXXVIII,(December 1952), p. 403.

In Springfield, Massachusetts, he spoke on the "New England Tradition." In Richmond, Virginia, his speech concerned the development of the "New South." Speaking in the Mormon Tabernacle in Salt Lake City, Utah, the [thesis] was the freedom of mind and "Liberty of Conscience." On United Nations Day he addressed the nation on the topic: "The United Nations: Our Hope and Our Commitment." In it he shared with the American people his beliefs concerning the destiny of men and nations.

In general, the speeches had a prevailing mood. In Miami the thesis was a review of economic gains that made possible that gay city. The mood was befitting a vacation spot. In San Francisco, the first seat of the United Nations, international policy was stressed.[14]

The scheme of speaking consisted of elucidating early in the campaign his ideas on the basic issues such as Korea, inflation, labor relations and farm policy. He made his "case" as quickly and concisely as he could, leaving the later days for refutation and reaffirmation.[15]

II. ARRANGEMENT

An examination of the disposition of speeches shows that Stevenson used the introduction to dispose the audience

---

[14] Ibid., p. 404.

[15] Loc. cit.

favorably to him and to make a genuine appeal for good will. Through psychological identification he sought to establish empathy with his audience. He relied on anecdote to allay prejudice, especially where the speech was a specific defense of the "record." Though he used the introduction for rebuttal it was never at the expense of good speech structure.

Stevenson's appeal was essentially argumentive, adhering to the forensic tradition of statement and proof. The disposition falls within the Aristotelian classification. It was arranged in a closely knit pattern beginning with an introduction or proem which usually included refutations of the opposition's argument made since he last spoke; a statement of the thesis and arguments; and concluding with peroration consisting of a restatement or summary of the topoi and an appeal for faith, hope and vision. The thought sequence was from past, to present, to future. Seldom did the pattern vary from a historical sequence closely paralleling the Aristotelian pattern. Stevenson's speech on "The Proper Role of Government" affords[16] an excellent example of the effective use of this method of arrangement:

The introduction was in the form of a narration into which is integrated rhetorical devices intended to place the opposition in the negative position of opposing the best

---

[16] "Address given at St. Louis, Missouri, October 9, 1952," Major Campaign Speeches, pp. 228-234.

traditions of democracy. Examples of antithesis are manifold throughout the speech and allusions are used to strengthen the narration.

> A year from now St. Louis will celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase. That act of statesmanship more than doubled the area of the United States. The value cannot be calculated. Yet the Purchase was opposed by the men of a conservative political party far gone in decay, split into quarrelsome factions, able to unite only in fear of the future and in noisy condemnation of Thomas Jefferson for daring to look ahead.
>
> They remind me of some of the men today, who know the price of everything and the value of nothing. They are the Old Guard Republicans who are making a desperate bid to direct the future of this country.
>
> What we really commemorate in 1954 is the triumph of Jefferson's belief in the American future...
>
> St. Louis stands at the keystone of our Continental Arch. Here the rivers and roads and railroads from the east joined the great north-south highway, the Mississippi. Here, too, people came from all over the United States to begin the great adventure of going West. Beyond St. Louis was an empty land and a great future.
>
> Today great cities lie along the route Lewis and Clark traveled on Jefferson's orders. Along the trails the wayfaring Americans found immense treasures in gold and silver, copper and oil and other resources. But they found no treasure a hundredth part as valuable as the land itself. The history of a century and a half is the story of how the empty land filled up.
>
> Population, wealth, power, productivity have all steadily increased in the United States. That fact is at the core of American life...An expanding economy has meant a steady use in the standard of living for us...
>
> Twenty-five years from now there will be thirty-five million more of us than there are now. At every dinner table set for four people there is an invisible fifth

> plate. In 1975 the land...will have to fill that plate as well as the other four. It will have to provide joists and rafters, flooring and roofing for a now invisible fifth house. This is a measure of the task cut out for us--and of the opportunity the future holds for men of vision and daring.[17]

In moving from the introduction to the discussion or argument the governing idea is explicit. He tells his audience: "I would speak to you tonight about our opportunities. I would speak to you of America's new frontier..."

The central theme of the exposition is strengthened by the refutative element which immediately follows the statement. It also serves as a transition from the narration to the argument.

> Before exploring this frontier, however, before suggesting what lies ahead in the next 25 years, let us glance backward twenty-five years. America in 1927 lived in a fools' paradise. It ended abruptly...in 1930. Numerous thoughtful men...questioned whether the system of American Capitalism could survive.
>
> It is history's old ironies that today the Republicans are accusing us Democrats of being enemies of free capitalistic enterprise--when the plain truth is that it was the Democrats that saved the American capitalistic system under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt.
>
> Today America is more prosperous than any other nation in history. Of course, the Old Guard orators are going around the country these days broadcasting gloomy warnings that our prosperity is false...This is nonsense. The truth is that our tremendous defense effort is holding us back, gobbling up the goods our people need at home and when we have at last won through to safer waters, we shall be able to work at a hundred and one tasks that need doing.[18]

---

[17] Ibid., p. 229.

[18] Ibid., p. 230.

The exposition follows with an explicit transition.

> But tonight I do not propose to talk to you about the past, nor about the Old Guard of the Republican party, in whose ranks my opponent has enlisted or been shanghaied; it doesn't matter which. I would speak to you about more important matters...[19]

The definition of governmental responsibility for the economic security of the nation is introduced through the use of pathetic proofs. The style is enhanced by the effective use of imagery through parallel antithetical statements. The phrasing and sentence structures are balanced in such a way that they are easily comprehended by the audience.

> ...How can we talk about prosperity to the sick who cannot afford proper medical care, to the mentally ill for whom there is no room in our own crowded institutions? How can we talk about prosperity to the hundreds of thousands who can find no decent place to live...And how can we talk about prosperity to a share cropper living on worn out land...[20]
>
> To these people, prosperity is a mockery--to the eleven million families in this nation with incomes of less than $2,000.00 a year.
>
> Do these facts shock you? They shock me. What can we do to improve this situation. There will always be the foolish and improvident. But we are concerned here with more than that. <u>And what is the proper role of government</u>?

The argument was essentially expository--deductive. The major premises are introduced in a characteristic forensic manner. Stevenson never ceased to remind the audience

---

[19] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 232.

[20] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 233.

that the Democratic Administrations were responsible for the desirable economic changes effected throughout the previous twenty years. Clearness of style is achieved by the use of analogy, definition and illustration.

> It seems to me that the answer is this: Government has three duties. First, government is an umpire, denying special privileges, ensuring equal rights, restraining monopoly and greed and bigotry, making sure that the game is played according to the rules...
>
> Second, government has the duty of creating an economic climate in which creative men can take the risks and reap rewards...
>
> Third, government has a duty of helping the people develop their country.
>
> The Federal Government made the Louisiana Purchase... No private corporation would have built Grand Coulee... Has any frontier in human history ever been opened without the help of government? Christopher Columbus discovered the New World but the Queen of Spain provided the ships. The American government not only bought the Louisiana territory, but subsidized the railroads that spanned it, opened government lands to homesteading, built TVA so the Middle South could lift itself out of the quagmire of want. Government achieved the miracle of atomic power...

The argument for broad governmental responsibility is seen as a necessity for bridging the Great American Frontier. The Great American Frontier is introduced as the great challenge to the growing force of productive might. Illustrations and statistical evidence are used to increase the union of thought and mental imagery.

> Right now there are sixty-two million Americans at work. During the next ten years there will be ten million more...ready and able to work. With their help

> we can lift our production from 336 billion dollars a year to 475 billion dollars a year.
>
> These are astronomical figures. What do they mean to you and me? They mean just this: The amount that each of us can spend can be lifted by some $600.00 per year by 1962. This amounts to $2,400.00 for a family of four. In other words we can make the familiar, ugly, grinding poverty in this country of ours a thing of the past.[21]

The argument becomes an organic whole through logical proofs connected by definite transition statements. Thus the speech has continuity of thought and clarity of organization. It builds to a climax through the use of proper emotional tone. The audience shares the pathos of the speech as part of the "drama" of the American story. The Democratic platform is then presented with a reiteration of his early campaign pronouncements.

Stevenson uses the technique of identifying the platform with the noble purposes of the candidate in such a way as to impress the audience with the probity of his cause. The responsibility of the audience is equated with the exhortation of his appeal.

The conclusion of the speech consists of a summary in which he again reiterates the virtues of his proposal by stating:

> That is our program. We take our stand upon the fundamental principle that the role of government is...this: to remove the road blocks put in the way of people by nature and by greedy men, to release the energies of the

---

21 Ibid., p. 234.

> people so that free men may work the great miracles of the future as they have worked miracles of the past...[22]
>
> ...No man then--his heart touched and his mind moved --could but reflect upon his country's destiny, his love for it, the greater as perils encompass it. In troubled time let us remember that the U. S. was born to greatness. Greatness was breathed into us at birth by the founders of the republic and if we be true to them and their teachings we cannot be false to ourselves.[23]

The conclusion of the speech continued as an exhortation for the responses of the audience to the challenge he has placed before them.

> Let us remember that our bigness springs from our fields, forests, mines and factories but our greatness springs from the charters of our freedom and from countless men and women who believed, and believing, wrought...
>
> And so I say that when we speak of our abundant future let us never forget to offer thanks for the riches of ours today. A new day is dawning. I do not say all problems are solved; far from it, but we have dared to try to solve them. We have courage to dare the new, the compassion to help the wretched and the vision to see what men can really be in a society of our dreams.[24]

---

[22] Ibid., p. 234.

[23] Ibid.,pp.234-235.

[24] Loc. cit.

CHAPTER VI

MODES OF PERSUASION

Adlai Stevenson's effectiveness as a speaker in part can be attributed to his ability to follow the flow of public opinion, to analyze pre-existing sentiment and to effect a proper adaptation of subject matter to the audience situation.

A greater effectiveness, however, is found in his method or mode of persuasion. As previously noted, while Stevenson adhered to the general structure of his party platform, his orations are in a large sense restatements of broad philosophical principles relating to government and politics. This is attested by a statement he made at the close of the 1952 campaign.

> ...I decided to adhere to the party platform as closely as I could and...perhaps further a little the classic purpose of a periodic restatement of principles and program enlightenment.[1]

I. ETHOS

Of significance at the early part of the 1952 campaign was Stevenson's effort to "educate and elevate." Respected as an intellectual of some renown he entered the "political arena" with an established reputation as a public

---

[1] Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., p. 24.

official of incontrovertable reputation. His greatness and modesty was beyond question. He moved swiftly with the energy and ease of a man whose body was at the command of an agile mind. Modest and almost shy, there was a quality about him that immediately demanded the attention and respect of the audience. He had the face of an intellectual. It was sensitive, alert and quick to register the subtleties and depth of his thinking. He did not have the aura of a hero who had made history, but he created the impression of a man capable of making it. As he began to speak his authority and stature made itself felt. His personality and strength would suddenly blaze forth in their full light.[2]

Stevenson displayed courage in stating without equivocation beliefs contrary to the interests of the groups he was addressing. The audience sensed immediately the integrity of a man more concerned with the moral virtue of an issue than in adapting the thesis to its specific prejudices.

In refusing to condescend to his hearers his speeches assumed a strong ethical mode. By doing so the electorate by November 4th had come to respect him in greater degree than his party. Thus, the greatest factor in Stevenson's emergence as a great moral and political leader on November

---

[2] John Mason Brown, "The General, The Governor, The Grass Roots," The Saturday Review, 35:10, October 18, 1952.

5th, 1952, was the persuasive effectiveness of his personal integrity.[3]

Brown states that in Stevenson's welcoming address at the Democratic convention the audience instantly realized that here was a man of exceptional spiritual endowment attributed in part to the attitude he displayed toward the electorate.

> He spoke as a man blessed with a fine mind who shared the fruits of his thinking with the convention and the delegates who were equally anxious to think with him and equally equipped to do so. In short, he treated the many as the few. What Governor Stevenson accomplished at the Chicago Convention he accomplished many times during the campaign.

The ethical appeal is found in the opening of every speech. It is manifested in personal references such as the following from the speech of acceptance.[4]

> That my heart has been troubled, that I have not sought this nomination, that I could not seek it in good conscience, that I could not seek it in honest self appraisal is not to say that I value it less. Rather it is that I revere the office of the presidency of the United States...
>
> You have summoned me to the highest mission within the gift of any people. I could not be more proud; better men than I were at hand for this mighty task...

The personal references are statements of humility and self depreciation.[5]

---

[3] Ibid., p. 41.

[4] "Speech of Acceptance," Democratic National Convention, Chicago, Illinois, July 26, 1952, Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., p. 7.

[5] Alvin R. Kaiser, "The Style and Personal Appeal of Adlai E. Stevenson," Journal of the Western Speech Association, 18:182, May, 1954.

I should have preferred to hear these words uttered by a stronger, a wiser, a better man than myself.[6]

One of Stevenson's techniques for creating an ethical mode was to establish a personal identity with his audience. Speaking in the Mormon Tabernacle, October 14, 1952 Stevenson told his audience:[7]

> I cannot speak to you tonight in this tabernacle without an awareness of the links of its history and that of the state from which I come. Many of us who reside in Illinois have tasted the wholesome tonic of humility in contemplation of the mistakes to which our history bears witness at Nauvoo--the beautiful place--in Illinois where your forefathers stopped on their long journey...
>
> It is 106 years ago now that there were those "burnings" the persecution, the mob violence and the murders which finally drove the men and women of the Mormon faith on Westward. When the caravans of those who today seek public office in this nation stop here with you to meet with you in your tabernacle they stop their clamor and harranging. They seek the responses of your hearts and your minds rather than your hands or your voices.

In New Orleans, Louisiana, Stevenson's personal identity is further exemplified in the following statement.

> When I was a little boy I spent several winters here in New Orleans...And I used to ride up and down Canal Street on the streetcars. No one ever paid any attention to me and now I come back forty years later and thousands come out to greet me on Canal Street. Something has happened and you have touched my heart, but the fact of the matter is that I love New Orleans either way.[8]

---

[6] Speech on Acceptance, op. cit., p. 7.

[7] Speech on "The Liberty of Conscience," op. cit., p. 245.

[8] Speech on "Tidelands Oil-Foreign Trade," Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., p. 235.

It was not the primary aim of Stevenson to identify himself or his cause with the noblest virtues of Americanism. Conversely, the speeches were broad deductive expositions of political philosophy. If Stevenson created the impression of establishing an ethical mode based on the above technique it was not his primary objective. Stevenson enobled the greatest attributes of his party[9] as a secondary means of persuasion.

Sincerity of expression, a component of ethical proof, was one of Stevenson's strongest attributes. Throughout many of his campaign speeches it is manifested in his style through allusions to noble and virtuous literary works by Shaw, Plato, Disraeli and lastly, the Holy Bible; and through the use of tropes such as the following allegory:

> If you like, this is the distinction between the things that are God's and the things that are Caesar's. The mind is the expression of the soul which belongs to God and must be let alone by government. But farm prices, minimum wages, old age pensions, regulation of monopoly, the physical safety of society, these are Caesars.[10]

It is manifested in delivery through his apparent timidity in his platform mannerisms and voice quality. On the platform he is given to reflection, evincing moral judgment, and stern self examination. The manner in which

---

[9] Cf. ante, "Proper Role of Government," p. 90.

[10] Speech on the "Liberty of Conscience," op. cit., p. 249.

his utterances are made conveyed humility, humor and the quiet reasonableness of a man who was addressing his countrymen without condescending to vulgarities and on a high level befitting the seriousness of the occasion.[11]

II. PATHETIC PROOF

Stevenson's strength as an orator lay in his ability to unite the emotional elements with the logical. His appeal was not primarily to the emotions of his hearers, but he seemed to recognize that emotion impelled action and was an integral part of any discourse. Briefly stated, Stevenson premised the pathetic appeal on the basic motives of his audience.

The integrity of Stevenson's logic was not vitiated by emotional excesses. At the root of Mr. Stevenson's persuasive appeal there always remained a logical constituent. The following statement from the peroration of Mr. Stevenson's speech on "Social Gains"[12] illustrates his ability to unify the logical and emotional elements. Of especial note is the use of adjectives to strengthen the appeal.

> We stand at a perilous moment in a perilous century. The false prophets of communism would offer us security without freedom. The false prophets of reaction would

---

[11] "What Stevenson Started," New Republic, January 5, 1953, p. 5.

[12] "Social Gains and the Public Welfare," Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., p. 199.

> offer us freedom without security. Every day these false prophets--both the communists abroad and the Republican Old Guard at home--tell us that freedom and security are incompatible.
>
> But we know they are wrong. We have proven that a free society is strong enough to take care of its own without losing its freedom. We know now that freedom and security are indivisible and any society which loses one, loses both...[13]

In the preceding excerpt, Candidate Stevenson made a strong emotional appeal to the basic motive of freedom and self preservation. The machinations of the Communist Party are equated with Old Guard Republicanism. The hearers are given the alternate choice between freedom and security or their antithesis.

The final exhortation affords another example of the use of pathetic proof. The style is charged with emotion by the use of the adjectives, new (dimension), spacious (future); and the possessive pronouns our (faith), our (passion). The style is given added emotional effect in the asyndoton, "born in freedom, work in dignity, live in peace..."

> We have made a new society here in America. We have given democracy new dimension. We have given our men and women a new strength. We are moving toward a spacious future--a future in which our children's children will be born in freedom, work in freedom, live in peace. This is our faith and with God's help, we

---

[13] Ibid., p. 205.

shall make our own the promise of the future.[14]

In the speech disposition, pathetic proof was more specifically used in the exordium and peroration, whereas the exposition and arguments subordinated the pathetic in preference to logical proof, which is the more intellectual element of conviction.

While pathetic proof is emphasized in the exordium and peroration, its use does not seem exaggerated. On the whole, the speeches are well balanced. The hearer is not aware that the speech was specifically intended to persuade. This is due in part to Stevenson's general use of "emotionally charged" language throughout the entire speech.

There is also the omnipresent ethos surcharging the speeches by its undertones of humility and apparent sincerity of purpose. These are strong emotional elements arising out of the man himself. Whitney states, "Like Roosevelt, Stevenson has the ability to convince his audience that he is an uncommon man with the interests of the common man at heart."[15]

Stevenson's use of pathetic appeal was also enriched by the use of ideas that had a moral basis[16] as in the follow-

---

[14] Ibid., p. 206.

[15] Alan Whitney, "Stevenson in Illinois," Nation, 28:341-343, April 12, 1952.

[16] Cf. ante., Basic Assumptions, p. 29.

ing appeal for a non-partisan approach to the Korean problem.

> Let's talk sense to the American people. Peace is far more important than who wins the election. Whatever party wins, the American people must be sure to win. Let us not place victory in a political campaign ahead of national interest.[17]

The persuasive appeal is punctuated with a style ornated with colorful language. Irony and analogy add to the persuasive quality. The emotional effect of the use of antithesis is clearly seen in such phrases as "success and disaster, peace and war," in the enthymimes"..strength is the road to peace," "weakness is the road to war;" "...My opponents say the threat to liberty comes from within. I say the threat comes from without...;" "My opponents say America cannot afford to be strong. I say America cannot afford to be weak..." Allusions to God is found in the epilogue of most of the speeches as in "with God's help," or "with faith in God." Finally Stevenson calls upon the philosopher William James for an analogy, the persuasive intent being a tripartate identification between the speaker and the audience.

> Let's talk sense to the American people. Peace is far more important than who wins this election. Whichever party wins, the American people must be sure to win. Let us not place victory in a political campaign ahead of national interest.

---

[17] "Address given at Louisville, Kentucky, September 27, 1952," Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., p. 181.

And let's talk sense about what we have gained by our determination, our expenditures, and our valor in Korea.

We have not merely said, we have proven, that communism can go no further unless it is willing to risk world war.

We have proven to all the peoples of the Far East that communism is not the wave of the future, that it can be stopped.

We have helped to save the peoples of Indo-China from communist conquest.

We have smashed the threat to Japan through Korea and so have strengthened this friend and ally.

We have discouraged the Chinese communists from striking at Formosa.

We have mightily strengthened our defenses and all our defensive positions around the world.

We have trained and equipped a large army of South Koreans, who can assume a growing share of the defense of their country.

We have blocked the road to communist domination of the Far East and frustrated the creation of a position of power which would have threatened the whole world.

We have asserted, and we shall maintain it, that whenever communist soldiers choose freedom after falling into our hands, they are free.

We have kept faith with our solemn obligations.

These are the values won by the fidelity and prowess and the sacrifices of young men and women who serve their country. We have lost many of our beloved sons. All Americans share in the bereavement of so many mothers, and fathers, of wives and sweethearts. The burden lies heavily on us all. We pray God that the sacrifices and the sorrows will soon end.

I would say one thing more about the great debate over our foreign policy. My opponents say the threat to our

liberty comes from within.

I say that the threat comes from without--and I offer the fate of the enslaved peoples of the world as my evidence.

My opponents say America cannot afford to be strong.

I say that America cannot afford to be weak.

I promise no easy solutions, no relief from burdens and anxieties, for to do this would be not only dishonest; it would be to attack the foundations of our greatness.

I can offer something infinitely better: an opportunity to work and sacrifice that freedom may flourish. For, as William James truly said, "When we touch our own upper limit and live in our own highest center of energy, we may call ourselves saved."

I call upon America to reject the new isolationism and to surpass her own glorious achievements. Then we may, with God's help, deserve to call ourselves the sons of our fathers.[18]

Stevenson's principal emotional appeal was to the desire for peace and security. Yet he never failed to show, through a logical analysis of the issues, an intellectual justification. He never belittled the intellect of the hearer.

Now my ideas about campaigning are simple and probably primitive. It seems to me that the American people want to hear about their problems, and that it is the business of the candidates to talk plainly on the issues. As I said in Los Angeles yesterday, I don't think that real issues are either beneath the dignity of political candidates or above the intelligence of the American voters.[19]

---

[18] Ibid., pp. 187-188

[19] Ibid., p. 187.

Much of the efficacy of Stevenson's persuasive appeal lay in his penetrating style. Ordained with a "lemony" sense of humor his irony and sarcasms became at one point in the campaign a minor issue. The "U.S. News and World Report" wrote:

> The quips and chortles with which Governor Stevenson enlivens his oratory now have become a campaign issue ...For Mr. Stevenson, the whimsical approach is scarcely new; a rich vain of humor and satire runs through his gubernatorial papers, including veto messages. The difference now is that his witticisms are reaching a much broader audience.[20]

The persuasive value of Stevenson's satire cannot be ascertained but it did serve to keep the man and the issues before the electorate. It also served as a refutative vehicle for denouncing the calumny of his opponents.

Placed in the role of an apologist, Stevenson attempted by the use of witty satire, a reversal of these roles. The following typifies his urbane sarcastic flair.

> I think it's ironic--but nonetheless revealing--that my distinguished opponent, my very distinguished opponent, feels compelled to prove that he is innocent of any association with Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. After all, there were four occasions on which the people of the United States indicated their desire to continue such an association. Nevertheless my opponent's trepidation is understandable. Joe McCarthy

---

[20] "Stevenson's Ghost Writers: 'Big Names' Lend Hand ...New Dealers Chip In, Too...But Adlai Distills His Own Quips," U.S. News and World Report, 33:57, September 19, 1952.

may get him if he doesn't watch out.[21]

In summary, Stevenson's use of pathetic proof was not a means by itself but a part of the tight fabric of what was a general speech style. Its emotional efficacy lay in his ability to use language effectively, in selecting materials that carried emotional impact. Kaiser states:[22]

> To this ability of selecting materials with personal appeal, of choosing the right word, and of constructing effective sentences, add the Stevenson touch of wit and anecdote mingled with figures of speech and figures of thought, and we have a text of modern eloquence.

III. LOGICAL PROOF

In the main, Stevenson's campaign was a program of talking to the people "consequentially and intelligently." He strove to put his views on record, to refute the opposition's arguments with all the rhetorical evidence and devices at his disposal.[23] His method was to illustrate and to describe "how and what." His beliefs were laid down in detail, but without commitment.

This being so, Stevenson relied more on direct logical proofs than on emotional-persuasion proofs. It is of importance to consider the measure to which he relied on

---

[21] "Address on Faith in Liberalism, New York City, August 28, 1952," Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., p. 52.

[22] Alvin R. Kaiser, op. cit., p. 183.

[23] Frederick W. Haberman, op. cit., p. 404.

the non-artistic elements of rhetorical proof as a partial means of determining with what degree of truth the ideas were promulgated.

Evidence. Seldom were the propositions stated without the use of one or more elements of evidential proof. A sampling of external data from the campaign speech on "Farm Policy" typifies the degree to which he regarded factual evidence. It is also indicative of Stevenson's belief in the persuasive value of factual items. In this 3,500 word speech, external data is used twenty-eight times. Of this, total statistical information was used fifteen times; personal testimony in the form of reference to authority was used twice; illustrative examples four times and personal experiences seven times.

The following excerpt attests to his ability to use factual data to rhetorical advantage.

> Farm ownership and the family farm are the foundation on which our whole agricultural system is built. From 1880 to 1932 we lost ground on farm ownership. In these years--years, incidentally when Republicans were mostly in power and hadn't yet invented the slogan "it's time for a change"--the proportion of farm owners declined, until by 1932, 43 per cent of all farmers--two out of every five--were either tenants or sharecroppers. That trend has now been reversed; three-fourths of our farmers now own their farms. We have recovered, in twenty years, the ground lost in the previous fifty. I've sold some farms and I've seen to it that they were sold to operators, not landlords, where possible.

> Things are not yet as they should be. Many young, vigorous and ambitious men would like to become owners of farms. What is more serious, many farmers cannot, with their existing land and equipment, make a decent living from the soil. In 1950, more than one million farmers had net incomes from all sources including outside employment of less than $1,000. How can a farmer rear, clothe and educate a family on that? We can take pride in our remarkable progress, but we cannot be complacent.[24]

Definition and example. In Mr. Stevenson's method of persuasion the thesis was frequently introduced as a rhetorical question. "Which Party best understands the meaning of change in the modern world? Which party has anticipated the need for a change and done something about it, or which party has resisted about every important change?"[25] In his campaign speech on "The Threat of Communism," the exposition consisted of a detailed logical definition of the communist threat:

> What is the nature of the threat which communism brings to the free world? It is the threat of an all-powerful state, dedicated to the extinction of individual dignity and individual freedom...to put it more simply communism is the death of the soul. It is the organization of total conformity--in short, tyranny--and it is committed to making tyranny universal...[26]

---

[24] "Address at the National Plowing Contest, Kasson, Minn., Sept. 6, 1952," Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., p.70.

[25] "Address entitled 'Time for a Change--?', Denver, Colo., Sept. 5, 1952," Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., p.58.

[26] "Speech entitled 'Threat of Communism,'" Albuquerque, New Mexico, Sept. 11, 1952, Major Campaign Speeches, pp.126-27.

In the campaign speech on the control of inflation, Stevenson combines the lucid power of example and definition to emphasize the distinguishing cause of inflation. The rhetorical question is used to introduce the expository element. The proceeding excerpt attests to Stevenson's ability to simplify an abstract economic concept; to convert the meaning into intelligible concrete terms. Noteworthy, is the use of analogy in which the meaning is brought within the spectrum of the listener's previous experiences. The definition of inflation is conveyed through analogical reasoning. "...an evil neighbor dumped a whole cup of yeast into the bowl...that is inflation."[27] The process through which the definition carries meaning is by comparison and contrast.

> If our question, then, is what we are going to do about inflation, we must first be sure we understand what cause it.
>
> Those who let their politics impeach their honesty tell you that inflation is the product of governmental waste and mismanagement. Whether this is legitimate politics I shall not presume to say. But as an explanation of the causes of inflation, it is pure poppycock. It's like a husband coming into the kitchen, seeing one potato peeling that is too thick, and exploding that now he knows why you can't make ends meet. I'm for the Government's peeling its potatoes with a sharp knife and miserly eye. And I've done some sharp and miserly peeling in Illinoismmyself. But I'm not

---

[27] "Address delivered Baltimore, Maryland, September 23, 1952, Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., p. 167.

going to fool myself or you that meeting a nation's inflation problem is that simple.

Prescribing a patent medicine with a good taste for a growth which may become malignant is dangerous practice. This is a kind of politics which places party victory above national welfare and assumes that the people are fools. I shall do neither.

The causes of inflation can, I think, be made plain. Let's stay in the kitchen a minute longer. It is as though we were making bread, and while we answered the phone, an evil neighbor dumped a whole cup of yeast into the bowl. That's the inflation story. In fact, that is inflation.

We have inflation today--not disastrous, but serious--because the gods of war, working through their agents in the Kremlin, have dumped a barrel of yeast in the bread of our economy.

American industry has been suddenly called upon to make tens of billions of dollars' worth of guns and planes and tanks and bombs. This is the yeast which causes inflation.[28]

In other instances Mr. Stevenson used historical exposition. The speech on "Political Morality" defines the morals of politician and politics through authoritative reference.

Andrew Oliver said in Boston more than 150 years ago: Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is not another in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures; neither is there any in which by a mere loss of nerve he may do such widespread harm; nor is there another in which he may so easily lose his own soul; nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. But danger is the inseparable companion of honor. With all the temptations and degradations that beset it, politics is still the noblest career any man can choose.

---

[28] Ibid., pp. 166-67.

> Now, I emphatically agree to the hazards and the dangers part of that quotation from Oliver, but how about the honor and nobility. That "politics" and "politicians" have become words of disrepute and abuse, epithets if you please, instead of words of honor and respect is nothing new, but it seems to me paradoxical and very sad in a republic governed by the governed.
>
> More recently than Oliver's comment of 150 years ago, Bernard Shaw said that democracy is a device that insures that we shall be governed no better than we deserve.
>
> Whose fault is it, then, that we get what we deserve in government and that the honor and the nobility of politics at most levels are empty phrases?[29]

Argument. The arguments used by Mr. Stevenson followed several methods of logical reasoning. He attacked the issues of the campaign by using the most effective means of persuasion possible. Although most of the arguments used were an expository-deductive type, the use of other methods of reasoning is common. In many instances, several methods were used within a speech. In the campaign arguments the issue was attacked by what he considered the most suitable method available. An examination of the speeches show a liberal use of analogy and induction but when considered in their logical whole, are part of a finely woven fabric, the function of which was to support a major contention. An inductive-deductive method was sometimes used where the direct refutative element is used as part of the argument.

---

[29] "Address on Political Morality delivered at Los Angeles, Sept. 11, 1952," Major Campaign Speeches, p. 101.

Where it seemed expedient to do so, he reasoned with his audience by showing a causal relationship between the interacting phenomena.

The focal point of Mr. Stevenson's arguments was the reduction of the issues to their most basic essentials. This was done by recasting the problems to give them broader perspection and by redefining the basic issues under consideration.

His skill at adapting his arguments to his opponent's major contentions is of importance. An analysis of a specimen speech should make clear the effectiveness with which he made this adaptation. That very important issue, "Time for a Change," provided a great deal of argumentation and is worthy of rhetorical analysis.

To his opponent's contention that it was "Time for a Change," Stevenson's problem was to resolve the issue to its most basic denominators. To the charge that the Democratic Administration was suffused with crime, communism and corruption, Stevenson argued from several constructions; Firstly, what is a singular case does not prove the rule... I hear them Republicans attack corruption as if there wasn't a single honest Federal employee...[30] While not con-

---

[30] "Address delivered in Denver, Colorado, September 5, 1952," Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., p. 62.

doning corruption he questioned the logic of his opponent's contention that Stevenson's election would be a continuation of corrupt government. In righteous indignation he protested.

> I want to say, as I've said many times before, that corruption in public office is treason...Any crooks that I can find in government will be exposed and punished as ruthlessly as I've done it in Illinois--Republicans and Democrats alike...

Logically, the line of argument was promulgated upon the definition that, "...government--any government--is not an end in itself, but exists to serve certain human purposes..."[31]

The second construction was to show that the changes which had occurred under the Democratic Administration were desirable. To present an effective total construction he admitted to the anomalous conditions confronting the government by stating:

> I've read enough of our history to remember the shameful periods after previous wars, and who was in power then? The Republican Party.
>
> But that doesn't condone the recent revelations of faithlessness. And I don't condone them and never will...

The third construction was based on "course of actions." Having admitted the need for a change, the line of argument is stated as follows:

---

[31] Ibid., p. 57.

> This year the Democratic Party nominated me for President...That's the best evidence that the Democrats wanted change too...The Democrat who wanted it most was President Truman...He knows that change--new men, new blood, new ideas, new methods--is helpful. He has not sought to interfere with the changes in the Democratic Party I have already made.[32]

The objective of the argument was to prove to the American people that although it was "time for a change," the Democratic Party had effected, on the whole, desirable change, and that the Republican course of action was without purpose--that it was characteristic of reaction and indecision.

The basic pattern of Mr. Stevenson's argument is outlined in the following brief:

I. Government is not an end in itself. It must serve certain human purposes.

   A. These purposes should be enlarged only with caution.

      1. The effort should be to leave as wide a range of activity as possible in private hands.
      2. What ought to be done for the public welfare should be done.
      3. Government should be competent.
      4. Those who hold in their hands the power of government must themselves be independent.
         a. This kind of independence means the wisdom and experience, the courage to identify the special interests and the pressures that are at work, to see the public interest and resist subordination.

   B. This election year can set the stage for great ideas and great events.

      1. "Feeling this, I assume my opponent, whom I honor, feels it too."
      2. "I can imagine nothing more false than to conceal these things from the American people."

---

[32] Ibid., p. 62.

3. In a contest for the greatest office, it is essential to talk sense to the people.
4. The people are not beguiled by denunciations and generalizations.

C. "Having stated the Rules...I shall talk about one of the biggest hazards: "It's time for a change."

1. The Republican platform does not tell us to what kind of a domestic or foreign policy they are going to change.
2. Republican candidates have clasped all social gains for the past 20 years.
3. The Democrats are denounced for not wanting changes and are then denounced for a subversive desire to change everything.
4. Which party best understands the meaning of change in the modern world?
5. Timing with respect to change is as important as change itself.
   a. "If my party has not met the challenge of change at the right time, there would be program in America for the Republican leaders to endorse."
      (1) Specific ideas are needed instead of harsh denunciations.
6. The nature of change--a continual process.
   a. Has been a continual change since 1932. These changes in twenty years have steadily raised the standard of life.
   b. They have given new hope to the underprivileged.
   c. They have proven to the slave world the capacity of free men to provide security and freedom.
   d. The General has embraced these changes. The Old Guard Republicans don't approve.
3. "If we believe in human progress...then we profoundly believe that it is always time for a change--to something better.
   (1) President Truman knows that change is helpful--he has not sought to interfere with the considerable changes in the Democratic Party.
   (2) The Republican leaders know this.
   (3) Corruption in public office is treason. "Any crooks I find I will expose."

7. "We believe in the right of peaceful and continuous change for the better."

D. "We believe in our ideals and in the necessity for justifying our exalted position in the world."

E. "We believe in a sense of dedication--in giving enrichment to human destiny."

The issue of communism in government is also an important source for argumentative study. The opposition had argued the issue from its worst construction. The campaign slogan, "Crime, Corruption and Communism" was voiced by scores of Republican campaigners. Stevenson attempted to correct the record in a speech entitled "Safeguards Against Communism."[33] In this argument, Stevenson sought to show through causal relationship that the effect [communist infiltration] was not due to the alleged cause, Democratic negligence. Secondly, he sought to show wherein the previous Democratic Administration had been more effective in preventing communist infiltration in the American political, economic and social institutions than had the previous Republican Administrations.

Before analyzing the problem through causal relationships he attacked the Republicans' alleged cause by charging that most of the falsity and misinterpretations resulting from the condition was"...swathed in fog and confusion."

---

33 "Address made at Detroit, Michigan, October 7, 1952," Major Campaign Speeches, op. cit., pp. 214-15.

"Most of this," he averred, "was created by the communists themselves seeking under confusion's cover to advance their evil purposes, while some had been created by political demagogues who [were] hunting for votes much more than for communists." This was followed by a statement in which he hoped to make clear the record of the two parties on the issue.

The greatest threat of communism, he stated, arose from poverty and despair following the defection of twelve years of Republican administrations. Softness and sympathy toward the communist party over twenty years of Democratic Administration could not have been the cause of Communist incursion as the...Agents of Soviet Communism first began making headway in this country in the 1920's. The administration was Republican at the time. The junior Senator from Wisconsin quoted what he said was a Department of Justice document to prove the existence of communists in the State Department. But he neglected to say that it described the situation in 1928, and that what it proved was the existence of a communist plot under the presidency of Calvin Coolidge.

Stevenson continued to lay stress to the genesis of the communist conspiracy in a strongly worded statement that the "...Republicans fumbled and bungled this nation into the Great Depression..."[34] Specific instance is used with

---

[34] Ibid., p. 216.

statistical proof to establish the contention that communism arises from other causes than Democratic administrative mal-feasance.

> You remember the winters of 1930 and 1931. Farmers in Arkansas organized to march on towns and loot stores ...Millions of American men and women waited in the breadlines...It is little wonder that across the land men and women--and especially the young--began to drift to the terrible conclusion that free government had reached the end of its rope. Reachout for a solution --the communist agents found ready converts among the unemployed, the farmers, the workers. It was then that some persons like Alger Hiss and Elizabeth Bentley, witnessing the devastation of capitalism and the menacing rise of Hitler became entangled in the Communist conspiracy...
>
> In the election of 1932, almost one million Americans voted against the capitalistic system. If the paralysis had continued in Washington, the one million votes cast against capitalism in 1932 might have swelled to ten million by 1936.[35]

It can be seen from the preceding analysis that Stevenson was refuting by causal analysis his opponent's use of post hoc for propter hoc reasoning.

Stevenson continued to show through a logical sequence in which he joined arguments from authority, analogy and specific reference to prove that the Democratic Administration from 1948 to 1952 had taken bold measures to expurgate communism within the government.

The effectiveness of the logical appeal cannot be measured with accuracy. It should suffice that the final desideratum was the establishment of truth.

---

[35] Ibid., p. 215.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The singularly distinguishing characteristic of Adlai E. Stevenson's oratory was the personal system of moral justice with which he formed his philosophical basis of judgment. It was the root of a political philosophy of timely importance. The speeches bespeak profoundly of this, a quality which clearly marked him as a political philosopher.

As a spokesman for a political party and as a statesman, he was distinguished by his scope of ideas. His discourses showed him to be a man of considerable intellectual vision. When he spoke on national and international problems his judgments were based on a thorough knowledge of history. He understood the uses of the past, a quality which enabled him to analyze issues in terms of their historical implications.

That Adlai E. Stevenson was an effective political speaker is attested to by his use of all the available means of persuasion. Faced at the beginning of the 1952 Presidential campaign with a collective audience which had become conditioned to a need for a change in national administration and an opposition party equipped with sufficient issues with which to effectively exploit this trend, it was an almost insurmountable task to effect a reversal. To do

this, he employed all of the rhetorical skills of a forensic speaker. He constructed counter-arguments with which he astutely exploited the weaknesses of the opposing arguments. Specimen speeches show his skill in constructing lines of argument. They also show that he made proper use of the three Aristotelian modes of persuasion: the logical, emotional and ethical. These he combined in such a way as to give maximum effectiveness without the sacrifice of the integrity of ideas.

The arrangement of the speeches indicated his consideration of the audience and the occasion. Each speech was an organic whole into which was woven rhetorical devices to give maximum persuasive effect.

To gain the respect of the audience for his personal integrity and to properly dispose them to his cause he made effective use of the ethical powers of his personal appeal. His was an appeal to the intellect of the hearers.--The quality most respected of all the elements of human integrity. Thus while speaking on a high intellectual plane he was able to bring about an equality between himself and the hearers. His appeal, however, was not limited to the intellectual classes; his speeches had the interest of all groups for their liberalism and for his fundamental attitude toward government and people.

Notwithstanding his effectiveness as a political debator, his basic thinking remained consistent throughout his public career. Although he was obliged to vary his line of argument on the important issues of the 1952 campaign, he never varied his basic assumptions. The speech premises showed a consistency in thinking which was in line with his basic ideas. The most dramatic example of this was his court deposition on Alger Hiss and his defense of it.[36] A study of speech premises show that he was more concerned with the integrity than the expediency of ideas. Therefore, the effectiveness of his oratory cannot be tested by the vote but by the degree in which he used the valid means of persuasion. In summary, he placed himself in the role of spokesman and leader of the Democratic party by not making immediate appeals at existing levels but by looking to the formation of long range policy for his party and his nation.

The speeches of Adlai E. Stevenson are worthy contributions to the annals of historic literature. They do not lose but gain in literary appeal when removed from the emotion of the political theatre. They will stand as broad dissertations on the future of America. They will retain their value as guideposts for future action for they are in essence statements of philosophical principles relating

---

[36] Kirkus, Vol. 2, March 15, 1953, p. 204.

to men and government.

How effective were the campaign speeches of Adlai E. Stevenson? Were they of enduring quality and will the basic ideas stand in functional existence? A partial answer lay in the following review of a collection of his 1952 campaign speeches:

> Not only is the text of the speeches valuable for a record, but today and tomorrow they read as well as they read yesterday. Like Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, Adlai E. Stevenson continually bears witness to the mastery of the English language, and a rare gift of expressinn of civilized intellectuality of pungent wit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Baird, A. C., Public Discussion and Debate. (Boston: and New York: Ginn and Company, 1937. 500 pp.

Brigance, Norwood W., editor, History and Criticism of American Public Address. 2 Vols, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1943.

_____, Speech Composition. New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1937. 385 pp.

Busch, Noel F., Adlai Stevenson of Illinois. New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1952. 350 pp.

Commager, Henry Steele, The American Mind. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952. 476 pp.

Cooper, Lane, The Rhetoric of Aristotle. New York: Appleton Century - Crofts, Inc., 1932. 259 pp.

Davidson, Donald, American Composition and Rhetoric. New York: Charles Scribner's, 1939. 355 pp.

Ewbank, Henry Lee and Auer, Jeffery J., Discussion and Debate. New York: Appleton Century - Crofts, Inc., 523 pp.

Hayakawa, S. I., Language in Action. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1941. 341 pp.

Hicks, John D., A Short History of the American Democracy. Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1946. 870 pp.

Hill, Norman, International Relations. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950. 536 pp.

Martin, John Bartlow, Adlai E. Stevenson. New York: Harper, 1952. 175 pp.

Sarrett, Lew and W. T. Foster, Basic Principles of Speech. Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1936. 577 pp.

Stevenson, Adlai E., The Major Campaign Speeches, 1952. New York: Random House, 1953. 320 pp.

Stevenson, Adlai E., Call to Greatness. New York: Harpers, 1954. 110 pp.

_____, Twenty-one Campaign Speeches. Forward by John Steinbeck; New York: Random House, 1952. 52 pp.

Thonnsen, Lester and Baird, A. C., Speech Criticism. New York: The Ronald Press, 1948. 542 pp.

B. PERIODICAL LITERATURE

Brown, John Mason, "The General, The Governor, The Grass Roots," The Saturday Review, 35:10-13, October 18, 1952.

Byrnes, James F., "Pro and Con of the Issues," U.S. News and World Report, 33:16 September 16, 1952.

Commager, Henry Steele, "Is It the Man or Is It the Issue," New York Times Magazine, 174:70, October 12, 1952.

"The Controversy in Congress over Federal 'Civil Rights' Proposals," Congressional Digest, 29:21, February, 1950.

Dewey, Thomas E., Robert E. Taft, and Wilson Wyatt, "Why We Won and Why We Lost," U. S. News and World Report. 33:69, November 14, 1952.

Lindley, Ernest K., "Impressions of Stevenson," Newsweek, 39:32, April 14, 1952.

_____, "Stevenson as a Campaigner," Newsweek, 40:26, September 22, 1952.

"McCarthyism-Is It a Trend," U. S. News and World Report," 33:16, September 26, 1952.

News Item in Time Magazine, 45:82, January 12, 1948.

Phillips, Cabill, "Stevenson: A Study in Political Science," New York Times Magazine, 174:341, April 12, 1952.

Stevenson, Adlai E., "The Liberty of Conscience," Complete text of speech; U.S. News and World Report, 33:100, October 24, 1952.

Stevenson, Adlai E., "Korea in Perspective." Foreign Affairs, 30:349-60, April, 1952.

_____, "Quotations from 1948 Democratic Convention Speech in 'Stevenson and Douglas in Illinois,'" New Republic, November 1, 1948, pp. 6-7.

_____, "There are no Gibraltors," (Northwestern University Founders' Day Speech) Vital Speeches, 17:284-288, February 15, 1951.

_____, "Proud of Accomplishments in Illinois," (Speech at Chicago, Illinois, Sept. 29, 1952) Vital Speeches, 19:5-8, October 15, 1952.

_____, "The States: Bulwark Against Big Government," Look, 14:12-15, June 3, 1952.

_____, "States Duty to Stem the Tide of Federal Centralization," (Address delivered at Illinois Fair, Springfield, Illinois, August 14, 1952) Vital Speeches, 18:675-678, September 1, 1952.

_____, "The Basic Issues of the Campaign," New York Times Magazine, 174:9, November 2, 1952.

"Stevenson's Ghost Writers," U.S. News and World Report, 33:57, September 19, 1952.

"South in Revolt," U.S. News and World Report, 33:28, September 26, 1952.

"What's the Washington Mess," U.S. News and World Report, 33:11, September 19, 1952.

"What Stevenson Started," New Republic, January 5, 1953, p.5.

Whitney, Alan, "Stevenson in Illinois," Nation, 28:341-343, April 12, 1952.

"Book Review," Kirkus, 2:304, March 15, 1953.

C. PUBLICATIONS OF LEARNED ORGANIZATIONS

Haberman, Frederick W., "The Election of 1952: A Symposium," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 38:403, December, 1952.

Kaiser, Alvin R., "The Style and Personal Appeal of Adlai E. Stevenson," Journal of the Western Speech Association.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Senate Bill #102, The 1951 Illinois Legislative Session, Springfield, Illinois.

1952 National Democratic Platform. The Democratic National Committee, Washington, D.C., 1952.

Excerpts from the Public Statements of Adlai E. Stevenson, The Democratic National Committee, 1952.

E. NEWSPAPERS

The Chicago Tribune, January 12, 1948.

The Chicago Tribune, February 28, 1948.

The Chicago Tribune, July 12, 1948.

The Chicago Tribune, January 11, 1949.

New York Times, September 13, 1952.

New York Times, October 12, 1952.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

ADLAI STEVENSON'S SPEECHES INCLUDED IN THIS STUDY

The following speeches are in: Stevenson, Adlai, E., The Major Campaign Speeches, 1952, New York: Random House, 1953.

"Speech of Acceptance," Democratic National Convention, Chicago, Illinois, July 26, 1952.

"The Beginning of the Campaign," Springfield, Illinois, August 14, 1952.

"The Nature of Patriotism," New York, August 27, 1952.

"Faith in Liberalism," New York City, August 28, 1952.

"War and Peace," Broadcast to the Armed Forces Overseas, August 30, 1952.

"Time for a Change-?" Denver, Colorado, September 5, 1952.

"Farm Policy," National Plowing Contest, Kasson Minn., September 6, 1952.

"The New West," Cheyenne, Wyoming, September 6, 1952.

"The One Party Press," Portland Journal Luncheon for Oregon Newspapermen, Portland, Oregon, Sept., 8, 1952.

"The People's Natural Resources," Seattle, Washington, September 8, 1952.

"World Policy," San Francisco, California, Sept. 9, 1952.

"Political Morality," Los Angeles, Calif., September 11, 1952.

"The American Future," Los Angeles, Calif., Sept. 11, 1952.

"Campaign Issues," Phoenix, Arizona, September 12, 1952.

"The Threat of Communism," Albuquerque, New Mexico, September 12, 1952.

"The New South," Richmond, Virginia, September 20, 1952.

"The Role of Labor," New York City, September 22, 1952.

"The Control of Inflation," Baltimore, Maryland, September 23, 1952.

"Economy in Government," Indianapolis, Indiana, September 26, 1952.

"Korea," Louisville, Kentucky, September 27, 1952.

"Social Gains and the Public Welfare," Columbus, Ohio, October 3, 1952.

"Safeguards Against Communism," Detroit, Michigan October 7, 1952.

"The Area of Freedom," Madison, Wisconsin, October 8, 1952.

"The Proper Role of Government," St. Louis, Missouri, October 9, 1952.

"Tidelands Oil-Foreign Trade," New Orleans, Louisiana, October 10, 1952.

"On Liberty of Conscience," Salt Lake City, Utah, October 14, 1952.

"Leadership for Peace," New York Herald Tribune Forum, New York City, October 21, 1952.

"The Hiss Case," Cleveland, Ohio, October 23, 1952.

"The United Nations: Our Hope and Our Commitment," United Nations Day Radio Broadcast, Springfield, Illinois, October 24, 1952.

"On Religion and Politics," Boston, Massachusetts, October 26, 1952.

"The New Force in America," New York City, Oct. 28, 1952.

"Business and Government," Reading, Pennsylvania, October 30, 1952.

"The Fundamental Issues," Brooklyn, New York, October 31, 1952.

The following speeches are in Excerpts from the Public Statements of Adlai E. Stevenson, The Democratic National Committee, 1952.

"Address delivered before the American Bar Association," Washington, D.C., September 19, 1950.

"Address before the Illinois Commission on Human Relations," Springfield, Illinois, October 11, 1951.

"Address before the New York State Democratic Convention," August 29, 1952.

"Address delivered at the Dedication of Temple Beth Israel," Chicago, Illinois, December 2, 1951.

"Address delivered at the Dedication of the Kiwanee," Illinois Armory, April 19, 1949.

"Radio Report to the People of Illinois," January 10, 1950.

"Address Before the Philadelphia Bulletin Forum," Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, March 22, 1950.

"Address before the New York Herald Tribune Forum," New York, October 24, 1949.

"Address before the Inland Daily Press Association, October 19, 1949.

"Address before the American Public Welfare Association," Chicago, Illinois, November 20, 1950.

"Address before C.I.O. Convention, Chicago, Illinois," November 20, 1950.

"Address at the Jefferson-Jackson Dinner," Springfield, Illinois, March 31, 1949.

"Address before the American Public Welfare Association," Chicago, Illinois, December 1, 1950.

"Address at the Peoria State Hospital," Peoria, Illinois, October 8, 1951.

"Address before the Illinois State C.I.O. Convention," Chicago, Illinois, December 9, 1949.

"Radio Report to the People of Illinois," May 23, 1949.

"Address before the Chicago Teachers Union," Chicago, Illinois, March 22, 1952.

"Radio Report to the People of Illinois," May 23, 1949.

"Address before the A.F. of L. Executive Council," Chicago, Illinois, August 10, 1950.

"Labor Day Address," Detroit, Michigan, Sept. 1, 1952.

"Address at the Illinois Housing Day Banquet," Chicago, Illinois, March 14, 1950.

The following speeches appear in the periodicals indicated:

"The Liberty of Conscience," U.S. News and World Report, 33:100, October 24, 1952.

"Quotations from the 1948 Democratic Convention Address," in Stevenson and Douglas in Illinois, New Republic, Nov. 1, 1948, pp. 6-7.

"There are no Gibraltors," Northwestern University Founders Day Address, Vital Speeches, 17:284-288,

"Proud of Accomplishments in Illinois," Speech at Chicago, Illinois, Sept. 29, 1952, Vital Speeches, 19:5-8, October 15, 1952.

"The States Duty to Stem the Tide of Federal Centralization," Address delivered at Illinois State Fair, Springfield, Illinois, August 14, 1952., Vital Speeches, 18:675-678, Sept. 1, 1952.

"Inaugural Address," Springfield, Illinois, January 10, 1949, The Chicago Tribune 108:5, Jan. 11, 1949.